DEFECT REPORT FORM

- 1. <u>Defect Report Number</u>: 9594/220 <u>Title</u>: CA Certificate and Basic Constraints
- 2. Source: IETF / ISO Rapporteur
- 3. <u>Addressed to</u>:
- 4. (a)
 - (b)
- 5. Date circulated by WG Secretariat:
- 6. <u>Deadline for Response from Editor</u>:

7. <u>Defect Report Concerning</u>: ITU-T X.509 (1997) | ISO/IEC 9594-8:1997

8. <u>Qualifier</u>:

Error

9. <u>References in Document</u>: 11.2 Note 3

10. Nature of Defect:

The current text requires that, if no extensions defined as critical are included in a CRL, the version element be absent from that CRL. While this may be helpful in some environments where backward compatibility with version 1 CRLs, this should not be mandatory behaviour. An issuer should be able to mark its CRL as v2 regardless of whether or not critical extensions are present. Note that some profiles (e.g. PKIX) require that all CRLs be v2.

11. Solution Proposed by the Source:

Modify the note to lift the restriction.

12. Editor s Response:

Accepted. The second sentence of note 3 will be modified by changing shall be absent to may be absent and the 3^{rd} and 4^{th} sentences of note 3 will be modified to reflect the change.

(Orlando meeting Apr 99)