

## PSEUDO CHANGE REQUEST

⌘ **33.310 CR -** ⌘ rev **-** ⌘ Current version: **1.0.0** ⌘

For **HELP** on using this form, see bottom of this page or look at the pop-up text over the ⌘ symbols.

**Proposed change affects:** UICC apps  ME  Radio Access Network  Core Network

<b>Title:</b>	⌘ Certificate enrolment		
<b>Source:</b>	⌘ Nokia, Siemens, T-Mobile, Vodafone		
<b>Work item code:</b>	⌘ NDS/AF	<b>Date:</b>	⌘ 30/01/2004
<b>Category:</b>	⌘ <b>F</b>	<b>Release:</b>	⌘ Rel-6
	Use <u>one</u> of the following categories: <b>F</b> (correction) <b>A</b> (corresponds to a correction in an earlier release) <b>B</b> (addition of feature), <b>C</b> (functional modification of feature) <b>D</b> (editorial modification) Detailed explanations of the above categories can be found in 3GPP <a href="#">TR 21.900</a> .		Use <u>one</u> of the following releases: <b>2</b> (GSM Phase 2) <b>R96</b> (Release 1996) <b>R97</b> (Release 1997) <b>R98</b> (Release 1998) <b>R99</b> (Release 1999) <b>Rel-4</b> (Release 4) <b>Rel-5</b> (Release 5) <b>Rel-6</b> (Release 6)

<b>Reason for change:</b>	⌘ Also manual certificate enrolment should be allowed.
<b>Summary of change:</b>	⌘ Manual certificate enrolment added.
<b>Consequences if not approved:</b>	⌘ Automated certificate enrolment by CMPv2 would be mandatory to use although there might be only few SEG elements.

<b>Clauses affected:</b>	⌘ 5.2.11 SEG certificate creation 5.2.13 SEG certificate renewal 7.2 Life cycle management										
<b>Other specs affected:</b>	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">Y</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">N</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">⌘</td> <td style="text-align: center;">N</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">⌘</td> <td style="text-align: center;">N</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">⌘</td> <td style="text-align: center;">N</td> </tr> </table> Other core specifications	Y	N	⌘	N	⌘	N	⌘	N	⌘	
Y	N										
⌘	N										
⌘	N										
⌘	N										
			⌘								
<b>Other comments:</b>	⌘ -										

-----  
----- CHANGED SECTION -----  
-----

### 5.2.11 SEG certificate creation

Using device-specific management methods, the certificate creation shall be initiated. As specified in section 7.2, either  
The CMPv2 protocol shall be used between the roaming CA and the SEG for automatic certificate enrolment or  
manual SEG certificate installation using PKCS#10 formats can be used. This is an operator decision depending for  
example on the number of SEG elements.

-----  
----- NEXT CHANGED SECTION -----  
-----

### 5.2.13 SEG certificate renewal

A new SEG certificate needs to be in place before the old SEG certificate expires. The procedure is similar to the SEG certificate creation and ~~can shall~~ be either fully automated by using CMPv2 as specified in section 7.2 or done manually using PKCS#10 formats. This is an operator decision depending for example on the number of SEG elements.

-----  
----- NEXT CHANGED SECTION -----  
-----

## 7.2 Life cycle management

Certificate Management Protocol v2 (CMPv2) [4] shall be the supported protocol to provide certificate life cycle management capabilities. All SEGs and Roaming CAs shall support initial enrolment by SEG from CA via CMPv2, i.e. receiving a certificate from the roaming CA, and updating the key of the certificate via CMPv2 before the certificate expires.

Enrolling a certificate to a SEG is an operation done more often than inter-operator cross-certifications, thus more automation ~~is~~ could be required by the operator than is possible with a PKCS#10 approach. However, also manual SEG certificate installation using PKCS#10 formats shall be supported. It should be also noted that the lifetime of a cross-certificate is considerably longer than the lifetime of a SEG certificate. The basic CMPv2 functionalities such as enrolment and key update are widely implemented and interoperable.

**Editor's note:** CMPv2 is still at draft status, but is already widely supported (see 'CMP Interop Project': <http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/00dec/slides/PKIX-4/>), and expected to move to Draft Standard status in the near future. Thus it is expected that CMPv2 receives a RFC status before the NDS/AF specification is completed. Additionally, CMPv2 is preferred to CMPv1(RFC2510), because of the interoperability issues with CMPv1.