

NOTICE OF REVIEW PERIOD – BALLOT 214

This Review Notice is sent pursuant to Section 4.1 of the CA/Browser Forum's Intellectual Property Rights Policy (v1.2). This Review Period is for Final Maintenance Guidelines (30 day Review Period). A complete draft of the Draft Guideline that is the subject of this Review Notice is attached.

Date Review Notice Sent: September 27, 2017
Ballot for Review: Ballot 214 – CAA Discovery CNAME Errata
Start of Review Period: September 27, 2017 at 23:00 UTC
End of Review Period: October 27, 2017 at 23:00 UTC

Please forward any Exclusion Notice relating to Essential Claims to the Chair by email to kirk.hall@entrustdatacard.com before the end of the Review Period. See current version of CA/Browser Forum Intellectual Property Rights Policy for details.

(Optional form of Exclusion Notice is attached)

Ballot 214 – CAA Discovery CNAME Errata

-- MOTION BEGINS --

In the Baseline Requirements v1.4.9 Section 3.2.2.8. CAA Records

Strike:

As part of the issuance process, the CA MUST check for a CAA record for each dNSName in the subjectAltName extension of the certificate to be issued, according to the procedure in RFC 6844, following the processing instructions set down in RFC 6844 for any records found. If the CA issues, they MUST do so within the TTL of the CAA record, or 8 hours, whichever is greater.

Replace with:

As part of the issuance process, the CA MUST check for CAA records and follow the processing instructions for any records found, for each dNSName in the subjectAltName extension of the certificate to be issued, as specified in RFC 6844 as amended by Errata 5065 (Appendix A). If the CA issues, they MUST do so within the TTL of the CAA record, or 8 hours, whichever is greater.

In the Baseline Requirements ADD an Appendix A that reads:

Appendix A -- RFC6844 Errata 5065

The following errata report has been held for document update for RFC6844, "DNS Certification Authority Authorization (CAA) Resource Record".

You may review the report below and at:

Status: Held for Document Update

Type: Technical

Reported by: Phillip Hallam-Baker <philliph@comodo.com> Date Reported: 2017-07-10 Held by: EKR (IESG)

Section: 4

Original Text

Let CAA(X) be the record set returned in response to performing a CAA record query on the label X, P(X) be the DNS label immediately above X in the DNS hierarchy, and A(X) be the target of a CNAME or DNAME alias record specified at the label X.

- o If CAA(X) is not empty, $R(X) = \text{CAA}(X)$, otherwise
- o If A(X) is not null, and R(A(X)) is not empty, then $R(X) = R(A(X))$, otherwise
- o If X is not a top-level domain, then $R(X) = R(P(X))$, otherwise
- o R(X) is empty.

Corrected Text

Let CAA(X) be the record set returned in response to performing a CAA record query on the label X, P(X) be the DNS label immediately above X in the DNS hierarchy, and A(X) be the target of a CNAME or DNAME alias record chain specified at the label X.

- o If CAA(X) is not empty, $R(X) = \text{CAA}(X)$, otherwise
- o If A(X) is not null, and CAA(A(X)) is not empty, then $R(X) = \text{CAA}(A(X))$, otherwise
- o If X is not a top-level domain, then $R(X) = R(P(X))$, otherwise
- o R(X) is empty.

Thus, when a search at node X returns a CNAME record, the CA will follow the CNAME record chain to its target. If the target label contains a CAA record, it is returned.

Otherwise, the CA continues the search at the parent of node X.

Note that the search does not include the parent of a target of a CNAME record (except when the CNAME points back to its own path).

To prevent resource exhaustion attacks, CAs SHOULD limit the length of CNAME chains that are accepted. However CAs MUST process CNAME chains that contain 8 or fewer CNAME records.

--Motion Ends--

EXCLUSION NOTICE – BALLOT _____

I hereby provide this Exclusion Notice for the Essential Claim(s) listed below:

Ballot Covered by This Exclusion Notice: Ballot: _____

CABF Member Name: _____ (Organization)

Date Exclusion Notice Sent: _____

Exclusion Notice provided by: _____ (Name)

Provide Exclusion Notice to current CA/Browser Forum Chair: Kirk Hall,
kirk.hall@entrustdatacard.com Exclusion Notices must be provided by deadline stated in related Review Notice.

(For each Essential Claim covered by this Exclusion Notice, please list “numbered section of the Final Guideline or Final Maintenance Guideline whose implementation makes the excluded claim an Essential Claim for each of the issued patent(s) or pending patent application(s) that a Participant reasonably believes at the time may contain Essential Claims the Participant wishes to exclude from the CAB Forum RF License” and also “make an election, (i) not to grant a license or (ii) to provide a license with all of the requirements of Section 5.1 with the exception of subsection 5.1 f.” See IPR Policy Sections 4.2 and 4.3.)

Essential Claim No.	Numbered section(s) of Guideline related to Essential Claim [Sec. 4.3]	Patent number for issued patent, title and application number for pending patent, or copy of patent application unpublished patent applications [Sec. 4.3]	License Grant Election Made [Sec. 4.2]
1.			<input type="checkbox"/> (i) no license granted <input type="checkbox"/> (ii) license granted per Sec. 5.1 except Sec. 5.1.f
2.			<input type="checkbox"/> (i) no license granted <input type="checkbox"/> (ii) license granted per Sec. 5.1 except Sec. 5.1.f
3.			<input type="checkbox"/> (i) no license granted <input type="checkbox"/> (ii) license granted per Sec. 5.1 except Sec. 5.1.f
4.			<input type="checkbox"/> (i) no license granted <input type="checkbox"/> (ii) license granted per Sec. 5.1 except Sec. 5.1.f

(Continue on second page if necessary)

Relevant IPR Policy Excerpts

4.2 Excluding Patents and/or Patent Applications from Royalty Free Licensing Obligations during Review Period.

Except for Essential Claims encompassed by a Participant’s Contributions that are actually incorporated into a Final Guideline or Final Maintenance Guideline approved in accordance with the CAB Forum Guideline approval process,

Participants may within the Review Period exclude Essential Claims from the CAB Forum RF License. In such case, Participant shall be permitted to either make an election, (i) not to grant a license or (ii) to provide a license with all of the requirements of Section 5.1 with the exception of subsection 5.1 f.

4.3 Conditions and Procedure for Excluding Patents and/or Patent Applications from CAB Forum RF License.

A Participant seeking to exclude Essential Claims from the CAB Forum RF License in accordance with Section 4.2 must provide written notice of such intent to the CAB Forum Chair (“Exclusion Notice”) within the Review Period, and the Exclusion Notice shall be effective upon its receipt by the CAB Forum Chair. The Exclusion Notice shall include identification of the numbered section of the Final Guideline or Final Maintenance Guideline whose implementation makes the excluded claim an Essential Claim for each of the issued patent(s) or pending patent application(s) that a Participant reasonably believes at the time may contain Essential Claims the Participant wishes to exclude from the CAB Forum RF License. For issued patents, the Exclusion Notice shall also include the patent number(s). For pending patent applications, the Exclusion Notice shall also include the title and application number(s). If an issued patent or pending patent application that may contain Essential Claims is not set forth in the Exclusion Notice, such Essential Claims shall continue to be subject to the CAB Forum RF License. For unpublished patent applications, the Exclusion Notice shall also include a copy of the patent application. Exclusion Notices shall be published at <https://cabforum.org/ipr-exclusion-notices/>. ***

8.1. Essential Claims

“Essential Claims” shall mean all claims in any patent or patent application in any jurisdiction in the world that would necessarily be infringed by

implementation of any Normative Requirement in a Final Guideline or Final Maintenance Guideline. A claim is necessarily infringed hereunder only when it is not possible to avoid infringing it because there is no non-infringing alternative for implementing a Normative Requirement of a Final Guideline or Final Maintenance Guideline. Existence of a non-infringing alternative shall be judged based on the state of the art at the time the guideline is adopted as a Final Guideline or Final Maintenance Guideline. If a Normative Requirement in a Final Guideline or Final Maintenance Guideline may be fulfilled by any of a list of specified alternatives, then for determination of whether a claim is an Essential Claim, each of the specified alternatives should be considered independently as if it were the only method for fulfilling that requirement. ***

8.3. Other Key Definitions ***

c. “**Contribution**” means material, including Draft Guidelines, Draft Guideline text, and modifications to other Contributions, made verbally or in a tangible form of expression (including in electronic media) which is provided by a Participant in the process of developing a Draft Guideline for the purpose of incorporating such material into a Draft Guideline or a Final Guideline or Final Maintenance Guideline. For a verbal contribution to be deemed a Contribution hereunder it must be memorialized within approved meeting minutes of the CAB Forum. ***