



Welcome to the World of Standards



CONCLUDING REMARKS OF “EDELIVERY IN EIDAS: LET'S MAKE IT STANDARDS BASED”

Presented by Juan Carlos Cruellas

Wrap up of session 1: ERDS standardization activities. Conclusions.



- Transparency of the standardization process (OASIS). Related with giving stakeholders the opportunity to interact with the SO and impact the production of standards.
- Also close collaboration of SOs is a must:
 - MOUS do exist.
 - Members participating in other's SO meetings.
 - Cross-commenting of specifications.
 - It would be great to build up a **common vocabulary (set of terms and their corresponding definitions)**, and if not possible to build one, provide clear mappings among different vocabularies.
- Common issues appearing in different eDelivery-related standards:
 - Identification of sender and recipient. Standards have to incorporate elements ensuring its achievement.

Wrap up of session 1: ERDS standardization activities. Conclusions



- Authentication in EU related to European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).
- Encryption also related to (GDPR).
- Time-stamping: any relevant step triggering the production of an evidence in the process should be time-stamped in qualified provision of these services.
- Services need to be provided cross-border.
- Trust building.
- Common infrastructure including also subscribers, evidence directories and service & capabilities discovering supporting.

Wrap up of session 2: Solutions and Services for ERDS and REM. Issues raised in round table.



- Actors in the market
- How they perceive:
 - The market
 - The need for “qualification”
 - The need for “interoperability”
- What they expect
 - From standard
 - From reference implementation
 - From “support”
 - From “EU marketing”

Wrap up of session 2: Solutions and Services for ERDS and REM. Conclusions.



- Standards are necessary from these two points of view:
 - Conformance assessment (qualified = valid). Crucial that fit within the EU accreditation scheme.
 - Facilitating interoperability (open markets, network effect)
- Different deployment modes are foreseen – still supporting infrastructure for interoperability is needed
 - Dedicated, sector specific, closed circuits (eJustice)
 - General purpose (EU-driven infrastructure? Similar to TL)
 - Might have implication on standards?
- Issues for legal needs
 - Different countries have different requirements on “registered delivery”
 - Standard should support them; legal applicability is out of scope in technical standards

Wrap up of session 2: Solutions and Services for ERDS and REM. Conclusions.



- “evidence” set as it was specified in ETSI TS 102 640 seems complete enough.
- Evolution might be more business driven than standard driven
 - P2p first – based on market opportunities.
- Block chain is important.
- Complete technical standards for facilitating interoperability, but also make them open for easily incorporating new technologies.
- No disagreement on the audience regarding the intentions of the STF to provide policy and security requirements that apply to ONE ERDS Provider. This will facilitate the individual auditing of ERDS Providers.

Wrap up of session 2: Solutions and Services for ERDS and REM. Conclusions.



- Acceptance/rejection of user content by recipient has to also be present in the standards (there are different usages of this feature, and even different levels of requirements for them in different countries).
- Building blocks are perceived as very good enablers:
 - They have proved to satisfy needs in real implementations.
 - Their components may be used differently in different contexts.
- Several AS4 profiles specified for satisfying specific requirements in different domains.
- Formats already specified for messages and evidences in ETSI TS 102 640 have been used not only within REM services but also in SOAP and WS based solutions.

Wrap up of session 2: Solutions and Services for ERDS and REM. Conclusions.



- Two potential approaches to interconnect different realms/services:
 - GATEWAY.
 - INTEROPERABILITY INTERFACE covering all the layers: semantics, syntax and underlying transport, which would facilitate aggregation of service providers.
- Lack of implementing act once standards are on the table, would represent a problem.
- Standards in eDelivery must allow full traceability of the process in a way that is trusted by any entity for unambiguously identifying who is responsible for carrying out a certain task in the process.
- There is the perception that getting the “qualified” label represents business value.

Wrap up of session 2: Solutions and Services for ERDS and REM. Conclusions.



- General believe: there will be some sector islands and a market for generic (not sector related) ERDS.
- Layered approach (semantics/syntax/bindings) taken by STF seems good to stakeholders at the workshop.

Wrap up of session 3: Auditing Schemes for ERDS & Supervision. Conclusions.



- 🌐 There are not national evaluation criteria, except those published in France and Belgium.
- 🌐 The panellists identify the need for an European standard to “translate” art 44 of the eIDAS Regulation into technical and policy requirements for the conformity evaluation process.

Wrap up of session 3: Auditing Schemes for ERDS & Supervision. Conclusions.



- On the sender's identification there seems to be an agreement on
 - usage of a initial identification validation/verification process when appropriated and strong authentication for further use of the service.
 - Not to be prescriptive with any technology/level of assurance as far as the identification process is equivalent to CA registration/identification process.
 - the criteria should be technologically neutral.
 - some use cases could be of help.
 - The use of strict requirements on the identification validation process could prevent much of the French, Dutch, and Spanish ERDSP to be in the market as a qualified provider.

Wrap up of session 3: Auditing Schemes for ERDS & Supervision. Conclusions.



- On the recipient's identification there seems to be an agreement on
 - usage of a initial identification validation/verification process less strong than the one used for the sender;
 - when possible, it is recommended the implementation of strong authentication for further access to the service.
 - the identification validation process/authentication shall be prior to the delivery of the content.

Wrap up of session 3: Auditing Schemes for ERDS & Supervision. Conclusions.



- In the case of a ERDS built using external services (Identification, communication, signature and time stamp modules), these shall require
 - Either all of them are qualified AND are under a common and centralized security and policy control domain with services/security processes implemented and audited
 - Or they are bound by contractual means, are under a common and centralized security and policy control domain with services/security processes implemented and audited, AND get qualified against standards/evaluation criteria

Wrap up of session 3: Auditing Schemes for ERDS & Supervision. Conclusions.



- Identification: solutions already existing on the market that meet requirements in eIDAS should be allowed, as otherwise this would be a blocking point for getting the qualified status.
 - Use of qualified certificates for identification seems obviously to be an option. But it should also be offered the opportunity of using other means.

Way Forward

- For ETSI ESI:
 - Keep producing standards.
 - Collaborate with other SOs.
 - Also collaborate with relevant key players on the field.
 - Confront drafts with stakeholders.
 - Suitably process comments stakeholders and implement resolutions adopted for them.
- For stakeholders.
 - Comment on the drafts that will be in the public domain for commenting next October 2017.

STF-523 contacts, comments and more info



Contact Details:

STF -523 Public web page:

<https://portal.etsi.org/STF/stfs/STFHomePages/STF523>

Electronic mail:

- Juan Carlos Cruellas: cruellas@ac.upc.edu
- Comments also to: E-SIGNATURES_COMMENTS@LIST.ETSI.ORG

Additional information on ETSI documents



ETSI Documents: Free download

<http://www.etsi.org/standards-search>

E-Signature news:

http://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?SUBED1=e-signatures_news&A=1

Further information:

<https://portal.etsi.org/TBSiteMap/ESI/TrustServiceProviders.aspx>

DON'T FORGET that drafts of EN 319 521, EN 319 531, EN 319 522 and EN 319 532 will be available for public comments by the end of October 2017.

DON'T MISS THE OPORTUNITY TO LET US KNOW YOUR COMMENTS.

Thank you!