



CA/BROWSER FORUM

# Bylaws Updates part 2

Dimitris Zacharopoulos  
CA/B Forum Chair

# Define specific release cycles for Guidelines

- ▶ Current issues
  - ▶ Administrative burden for officers
  - ▶ CAs may need to implement changes outside their regular development cycles
  - ▶ Auditors are often not prepared or **do not have defined audit criteria** to assess new requirements
  - ▶ Alignment with other SDOs (ETSI/WebTrust) is very challenging and takes at least 6 months
  - ▶ Auditors are confused and have no uniform guidance for resolving conflicts caused by different versions of CABF/ETSI/WT during an audit period

# Define specific release cycles for Guidelines (cont.)

## ▶ Proposal 1

- ▶ Ballots and IP Review continues as-is
- ▶ New Guidelines to be **released** twice a year (**March 15, September 15**) by incorporating all Ballots with cleared IPR. Allow CWGs to pick different dates if we really need that.
- ▶ **Emergency Guidelines would be released bypassing the 6-month limit.** Decision about whether a Ballot is declared an “Emergency Maintenance Guideline” could be done by a separate Ballot with a strict 7 days discussion and 7 days voting period

## ▶ Opposition

- ▶ *“I’ve raised my opposition before, and I have taken into account the emergency options. Part of my opposition is to the idea that selecting an effective date that is not one of the preferred dates needs to be considered an emergency in order to occur. I don’t believe adding this additional “gate”, especially formally, to the ballot process is necessary nor particularly helpful. CAs may need to implement changes outside their regular development cycles”*

## ▶ Response

- ▶ CAs will implement changes as ballots pass but the changes would become effective when the guideline is released
- ▶ CAs would be better prepared (release new CP/CPS, communicate changes to Subscribers, etc)
- ▶ Audit standards, auditor practices/guidance would be better prepared to audit the new requirements
- ▶ Declaring an “emergency ballot” to bypass the preferred release dates should be easier

# Define specific release cycles for Guidelines (Cont.)

- ▶ Proposal 2
  - ▶ New Guidelines to be **released** on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of odd months avoiding January and November (**March 15, May 15, July 15, September 15**)
  - ▶ No Emergency ballot bypass
- ▶ Opposition for Proposal 2 is the **July 15** date which is in the middle of the summer and is usually vacation time for lots of employees
- ▶ Proposal 3
  - ▶ Ballots and IP Review continues as-is
  - ▶ New Guidelines to be **released** twice a year (**March 15, September 15**) by incorporating all Ballots with cleared IPR. Allow CWGs to pick different dates if we really need that.
  - ▶ **Emergency Guidelines would be released bypassing the 6-month limit.** A Ballot is declared an “Emergency Maintenance Guideline” by just having a **proposer and two endorsers**, without the need for a formal vote.