# Policy Proposal 2007-3

## Documentation of the X.509 Authentication Method

# Policy Proposal 2007-3
# History

| | |
|---|---|
| Introduced on PPML | 25 OCT 06 |
| Designated Formal Proposal | 16 FEB 07 |
| First PPM Discussion | ARIN XIX |
| Last Revision | Not Revised |

Proposal Text In Meeting Packet
http://www.arin.net/policy/2007_3.html

# Policy Proposal 2007-3 Description

- Supports X.509 authentication; relies on the adoption of Policy Proposal 2007-1: Reinstatement of PGP Authentication Method.

***********************************

AC Shepherds

- Leo Bicknell
- Bill Darte
- Matt Pounsett

# Policy Proposal 2007-3
# Legal Assessment*

Liability Risk: None

* April 2007

# Policy Proposal 2007-3
# Staff Comments*

- The proposal uses the term "crypt-auth" as a notation to be affixed to POC records. Such notation is not technically necessary for ARIN systems to discern authentication methods, because mere existence of a stronger-authentication method than mail-from can (and currently does) automatically disable mail-from authentication.
- We recommend that a new NRPM section be created, "12. Communications" and that 12.1 be "Authentication". The subsequent numbering would change appropriately.

* April 2007

# Policy Proposal 2007-3
# Staff Comments (cont.)

- At this time, ARIN's functionality covers only e-mail based communication. The policy uses the general term, "communication", which may be interpreted to cover other forms of electronic interaction such as web-based communication. The only other "communication" that is directly tied into a specific POC is voting. Should the Election System need to be modified to allow x.509 authentication, assuming we could use parts of the existing system, a ballpark estimate on implementation would be 3-4 months.

# Policy Proposal 2007-3 Implementation Assessment*

- Resource Impact: Minimum
- Implementation: 120 days After BoT Ratification
- Implementation Requirements:
  - Election System Software Changes
  - Guidelines Change
  - Staff Training

* April 2007

# Policy Proposal 2007-3
# PPML Discussion

- 2 for, 1 against
- Comments:
  - “Having once considered how I would go about arranging for secured email via X.509 or PGP, I settled first on X.509 as it was easier to document a policy for that. The relationship is "clearer" in that one side asserts that there is a binding between some cryptographic data and an identified object.”
  - "This is the kind of rathole you get into when you put too many details into a policy. Policy is not a process document. Policy is a general framework that defines limits, mandates, etc.”
  - “What if a POC has both an PGP-signed-by-ARIN key and an ARIN issued X.509 certificate?”

| Posts | People |
|---|---|
| 23 | 10 |

# Policy Proposal 2007-3

http://www.arin.net/policy/2007_3.html