

Trust Anchor Management (TAM) Specifications

March 22, 2010

Carl Wallace

cwallace@cygnacom.com

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
 - http://www.rfc-editor.org/cluster_info.php?cid=C56
- 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