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Suggested Way Forward (from Hiroshima)

- 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
Since Hiroshima

- TAF became a charter member of [C56] following completion of IETF last call
  - Blocked on draft-ietf-pkix-new-asn1

- TAMP -05 submitted in December
  - Entered IETF last call in February
  - Draft -06 submitted in March to address comments
  - Draft -07 in-progress to address some additional comments

- No activity relative to TAM requirements draft
Since Hiroshima (continued)

• Current PKIX drafts
  – draft-ietf-pkix-ta-format-04
  – draft-ietf-pkix-tamp-06
  – draft-ietf-pkix-ta-mgmt-reqs-04

• Related non-PKIX drafts
  – draft-wallace-using-ta-constraints-02
  – draft-housley-cms-content-constraints-extn-03
TAMP changes

-05 includes the following changes
  - new security consideration describing sequence number handling

-06 includes the following changes
  - Minor wordsmithing throughout, some additional references, typo fixes
  - Added some additional error codes and clarified usage of some existing error codes
  - Added new language to provide rationale for only requiring support for TrustAnchorUpdate and to clarify responses may not be received from all consumers of a given TAMP message
  - Added additional clarifying language to HTTP section and media type registration section
Suggested Way Forward

- Address any additional issues raised during IESG review of TAMP
- Submit TAM requirements draft to IESG as informational