

1
2
3
4
5
6

**Recommendation for ensuring legally significant trusted
trans-boundary electronic interaction**

draft
version 0.2

7	Contents	
8		
9	Foreword.....	3
10	Executive summary	3
11	1. Recommendation № ____ : Recommendation for ensuring legally significant trusted trans-	
12	boundary electronic interaction.....	3
13	1.1. Scope.....	3
14	1.2. Benefits	3
15	1.3. Use of International Standards	3
16	1.4. Recommendation	3
17	2. Guidelines on how to implement the recommendation	3
18	2.1. Terms and Definitions.....	3
19	2.2. Coordination	5
20	2.3. Ensuring technical interoperability	5
21	2.4. Levels of trust	5
22	2.5. Communication with organizations in different areas of standardization	5
23	ANNEX 1	6
24	Terms and Definitions	6
25		

26 **Foreword**

27

28 **Executive summary**

29

30

31 **1. Recommendation № ____ : Recommendation for ensuring legally**
32 **significant trusted trans-boundary electronic interaction**

33

34 **1.1. Scope**

35

36

37 **1.2. Benefits**

38

39

40 **1.3. Use of International Standards**

41 *if applicable*

42

43

44 **1.4. Recommendation**

45 *recommended practice*

46

47

48 **2. Guidelines on how to implement the recommendation**

49

50

51 **2.1. Terms and Definitions¹**

52 For the purposes of this document the following terms apply:

53 ***electronic interaction***

54 – a way of *information interaction* based on use of information and communication
55 technologies (ICT). ICT refers to technologies that provide information processing
56 (creation, access, transformation, transmission, destruction, etc.) in the telecommunication
57 context².

58 ***legal significance (of an action)***

59 – a property of an action (of a process) to originate (to result in) documents (*data unit*)
60 possessing *legal validity*.

61

¹ *Italic face* tags the terms defined in the current Recommendation

² ICT is similar to Information Technology (IT), but focuses primarily on communication technologies. This includes the Internet, wireless networks, cell phones, and other communication mediums

62 ***legal validity (of a document, or, generally, of data)***

63 – a property of a document (*data unit*) to be applicable for judicature, i.e. be deemed to have
64 satisfied the requirements of applicable law. The *legal validity* is conferred to a document
65 by the legislation in force, by the authority of its issuer and by the established order of its
66 issuing (e.g. it shall be usable for a subsequent reference).

67 ***level of qualification (of a service)***

68 – a property of a *service* to evidently fulfil a pre-defined set of requirements on it.

69 A service may be a *trust service* or an *authentication service* or any other kind of services,
70 to which this term may be applicable.

71 There may be different, usually incremental *qualification levels* of a service like ‘zero’,
72 ‘basic’, ‘medium/advanced’, ‘high/qualified’ etc. The lower is the *level of trust* between
73 the participants of *information interaction*, the higher might be demand on the
74 *qualification level* of *services* used by them.

75 **levels of trust** (between the participants of *information interaction*)

76 – a societal function determining the degree of trust between the participants of *information*
77 *interaction*. Depending on an established or felt level of trust, the participants of
78 *information interaction* are prepared to share a certain amount of resources and to jointly
79 use certain infrastructures.

80 For example, with conditionally ‘high’ or ‘medium’ level of mutual trust between the
81 participants, they may be prepared to jointly use centralized international services applied
82 according to the standards agreed upon. In case of conditionally ‘low’ level of trust, the
83 participants may be prepared to use only services built according to the decentralized
84 principle – own services of each participant with a kind of link between them.

85 ***trust service***

86 – (high level definition) - an electronic service purposing to ensure a certain *level of trust*
87 between the participants of *electronic interaction*.

88 or

89 – (lower level definition, will be clarified during Recommendation development) -

90 1. a service that is reasonably secure from intrusion and misuse; provide a reasonable
91 level of availability, reliability, and correct operation; are reasonably suited to performing
92 their intended functions; and enforce the applicable security policy.

93 2. trust service is a set of requirements and enforcement mechanisms for parties to
94 authenticate and exchange information

95 3. eIDAS definition.

96

97

98 ***trusted electronic interaction***

99 – the exchange of any data in electronic form in such a way that a user of these data
100 undoubtedly accepts them according to its Operational Policy. It is a matter of a concrete
101 Operational Policy, which way is considered as a *trusted* one. Hence, the determination of
102 the trustworthiness of some data varies from one concrete case to another. Trusted electronic
103 interaction is provided by using *trust services*.

104 **2.2. Coordination**

105 *Identify the principles of establishing and operating regional and international coordination*
106 *organizations for ensuring trust in infrastructures that satisfy organizational and*
107 *administrative regulation of legally significant trans boundary electronic data exchange*

108 *Identify the underlying principles and content for Model MoUs/Agreements between two or*
109 *more countries regarding Mutual Recognition of Digital and Electronic Signature*
110 *Certificates*

111 **2.3. Ensuring technical interoperability**

112 *Identify approaches to ensuring interoperability of technical systems, infrastructures of trans*
113 *boundary electronic data exchange and end users including functional requirements and*
114 *information security requirements.*

115 *Identify appropriate trust services types provided by the trusted infrastructures for ensuring*
116 *legally significant trans boundary electronic data exchange.*

117 **2.4. Levels of trust**

118 *Identify the possible levels of trust afforded by the trusted infrastructures and mechanisms by*
119 *which these levels can be provided. For example, lower levels of trust may not require*
120 *government directives for achieving a legally significant electronic interaction. UN/CEFACT*
121 *recognizes that guidance for required levels (possibly higher) of trust and for desired levels of*
122 *authentication depends on specific circumstances but such guidance does not constitute the*
123 *scope of this recommendation. For these different levels of trust identify:*

124 *- common set of requirements trust services must comply with. Such requirements are to cover*
125 *the following aspects: security, accessibility, and interoperability*

126 *- best practices for trust services initiation, certification and audit procedures.*

127 **2.5. Communication with organizations in different areas of standardization**

128 *Identification of international organizations in different areas of normative and legal*
129 *regulation and policies (such as WTO, UNCITRAL, WCO and others) for participation in the*
130 *defining conditions for establishing necessary level of trust between the participants of the*
131 *trusted infrastructure that will ensure legal significance of transboundary electronic*
132 *exchange of data issued in different jurisdictions.*

133 *Identification of international organizations in different areas of standardization (such as*
134 *ISO, W3C, ETSI and others) for participation in all the technical aspects of forming and*
135 *functioning transboundary trust space.*

136 **ANNEX 1**

137 **Terms and Definitions³**

138 ***authentication***

139 – Anders Tornqvist: means an electronic process that allows the **confirmation** of the
140 electronic identification of a natural or legal person; or of the origin and integrity of an
141 electronic **data**.

Примечание [AN1]: I agree.

142 – Igor Furgel: a process of the verification of *authenticity*. A successful *authentication*
143 (along with other factors) can be a necessary condition for the determination of the *legal*
144 *validity* (of an *entity*).

145 – Eric E Cohen ([http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-](http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf)
146 [Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf](http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf)):

147 1. The act of verifying identity (i.e., user, system)

148 Scope Note: Risk: Can also refer to the verification of the correctness of a piece of data

149 2. The act of verifying the identity of a user and the user's eligibility to access
150 computerized information

151 Scope Note: Assurance: Authentication is designed to protect against fraudulent logon
152 activity. It can also refer to the verification of the correctness of a piece of data.

Примечание [IF2]: This is
,authorization', but not
,authentication', see below

153 – Ramachandran: the process of validating the identity of someone or something. Generally
154 authentication requires the presentation of credentials or items of value to really prove the
155 claim of who you are. The items of value or credential are based on several unique factors
156 that show something you know, something you have, or something you are.

157 A process used to confirm the identity of a person or to prove the integrity of specific
158 information. Message authentication involves determining its source and verifying that it
159 has not been modified or replaced in transit.

160

161 ***authenticity***

162 – Anders Tornqvist: means that the **data** can be checked for its **authenticity** in a certain
163 context.

164 – Igor Furgel: the property of an entity to evidence the identity of its issuer.

165 – Ramachandran:

166 1. The *authenticity* is an auditable process that ensures a high level of quality in the
167 results by maintaining evidence of trustworthiness of the identity and integrity of data
168 messages

169 2. *Authenticity* is the status of being dependable in regard to evidence of identity and
170 integrity in accordance with the agreed level of assurance.

171 3. *Authenticity* is generally understood in law to refer to the genuineness of a document
172 or record, that is, that the document is the “original” support of the information it

Примечание [AN3]: –Cf the
VAT Directive 2010/45 where in
relation to the “authenticity” of an
invoice the following is
commented: “The supplier must be
able to provide assurance that the
invoice was indeed issued by him
or in his name and on his behalf.”
–

Примечание [IF4]: ,authentic
ity' is defined by using
,authenticity'; it is a dead loop.

³ *Italic face* tags the terms defined in the current Recommendation

173 contains, in the form it was recorded and without any alteration.” Authenticity is the
174 property of being genuine and able to be verified and trusted.
175 4. *Authenticity* in the electronic environment, further to the high levels of identification,
176 evidentiary and attribution functions may be able to be established through an
177 “authentication framework.” This “authentication framework” would involve legal
178 infrastructure, some technical infrastructure and some organizational infrastructure.

179

180 ***authorization (as a process)***

181 – **Eric E Cohen**: the approval, permission, or empowerment for someone or something to do
182 something.

183 – **Igor Furgel**: approving a subject (a person, an IT component or a process acting on behalf
184 of them) for the execution of a certain action.

185 ***certificate***

186 – **Jari Salo** (<http://www.uncitral.org/pdf/english/texts/electcom/ml-elecsig-e.pdf>):
187 means a data message or other record confirming the link between a *signatory* and
188 signature creation data.

189 ***data unit***

190 a set of digits or characters treated as a whole.

191 ***digital certificate***

192 – **Aleksandr Sazonov**: means a data message or other record confirming the link between a
193 public key (validation data) to a particular distinguished name in the X.500 tradition.

194 – **Igor Furgel**: means an electronic attestation which links signature validation data of an
195 entity to the entity and confirms the identity of that entity.

196 ***digital signature***

197 – **Eric E Cohen** ([http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-](http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf)
198 [Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf](http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf)):

199 A piece of information, a digitized form of signature, that provides sender authenticity,
200 message integrity and non-repudiation.

201 A digital signature is generated using the sender’s private key or applying a one-way hash
202 function.

203 – **Igor Furgel** (ISO 7498-2 (1989): ‘Information processing systems - Open Systems
204 Interconnection - Basic Reference Model - Part 2: Security Architecture’):

205 Data appended to, or a cryptographic transformation of, a *data unit* that allows a recipient
206 of the *data unit* to prove the source and integrity of the *data unit* and protect against
207 forgery, e.g. by the recipient.

Примечание [s5]: Eric E Cohen This is in contrast to when you care not whether the agent is authorized, only that they are who they say they are - authentication. The two are usually considered orthogonal; you normally only wish to check one or the other. I believe in transboundary efforts, authorization is more important than authentication.

208 – Ramachandran: a *digital signature* is made when the owner of a key pair uses its private
209 key to "sign" a message. This signature can only be verified by the corresponding key.

210 *electronic signature*

211 – Anders Tornqvist & DIRECTIVE 1999/93/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
212 AND OF THE COUNCIL of 13 December 1999 on a Community framework for
213 electronic signatures: means data in electronic form which are attached to or logically
214 associated with other electronic data and which serve as a method of authentication.

215 – Eric E Cohen ([http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-](http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf)
216 [Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf](http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf)):

217 Any technique designed to provide the electronic equivalent of a handwritten signature to
218 demonstrate the origin and integrity of specific data.

219 Digital signatures are an example of electronic signatures.

220 – Igor Furgel:

221 data in electronic form which are attached to or logically associated with other electronic
222 data. *Electronic signature* documents a relationship between the *signatory* and these other
223 electronic data and enables (also) a third party to subsequently ascertain this relationship.

224 – Jari Salo (<http://www.uncitral.org/pdf/english/texts/electcom/ml-elecsig-e.pdf>):

225 data in electronic form in, affixed to or logically associated with, a data message, which
226 may be used to identify the signatory in relation to the data message and to indicate the
227 signatory's approval of the information contained in the data message.

228 – Ramachandran: Data in electronic form in, affixed to or logically associated with, a data
229 message, which may be used to identify the signatory in relation to the data message and
230 to indicate the signatory's intention in respect of the information contained in the data
231 message. An electronic signature should not be discriminated because of its origin. But
232 may be discriminated because of their intrinsic qualities

233

234 *entity*

235 – Igor Furgel: can be a document, a record, an identifier etc (generally: a *data unit*).

236 *genuineness (in IT)*

237 – Igor Furgel: *integrity + authenticity* = the property of an *entity* to evidence:

238 (a) not having been altered from that created by its issuer

239 AND

240 (b) the identity of its issuer.

241 – Ramachandran: the quality that ensure document's property of being genuine.

242 *genuineness (in law)*

243 – Igor Furgel: ([130201+Rec14+survey+on+def_levels+consolidated+responses](#)):

244 "Authenticity is generally understood in law to refer to the *genuineness* of a document or
245 record, that is, that the document is the "original" support of the information it contains, in

Примечание [IF6]: This definition is not a full one, there are also other services of electronic signature.

The main services of a signature are (i) perpetuation function (a signature can be verified by anybody later on at any time), (ii) the determinability of the identity of signatory. Additionally, there are warning and consciousness functions.

Примечание [IF7]: There is a quite controversial discussion on it.

Код поля изменен

Примечание [IF8]: Not unconditionally an approval, but, generally, a relationship between the signatory and the message

Примечание [AN9]: The UNCITRAL definition is not uncontroversial. We should also look at the new definitions of e-signature and e-seal of the EU EIDAS Regulation, rather than the -99 Directive referenced above.

Примечание [IF10]: The footnote No. 5 in the REC. 14 may also be helpful here:

"In general, signature and authentication in an Information Technology (IT) environment often encompass some inherent functions which can vary from integrity, genuineness, proof, security, etc. Again, all of these terms can have differing interpretation based on environment and geography. This Recommendation has been prepared to align itself with the works of UNCITRAL while remaining consistent with the use of these terms in other UNECE trade recommendations. When reading or drafting any text on the subject, clear identification of which approach is being used, is recommended. For legislators who will probably use a legal definition, reference to UNCITRAL documents on the subject is recommended in order to clearly identify the legal use of these terms. "

246 the form it was recorded and without any alteration.” *Authenticity* is the property of being
247 *genuine* and *able to be verified and trusted*”.

248 ‘*Genuineness*’ in law is equivalent to ‘*authenticity*’.

249 *information interaction*

250 – Igor Furgel: the interchange of any data between the participants of interaction

251 *integrity*

252 – Igor Furgel: the property of an *entity* to evidence **not having been altered from that**
253 **created by its issuer**.

254 – Eric E Cohen ([http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-](http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf)
255 [Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf](http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf)):

256 **Guarding against** improper information modification or destruction, and includes ensuring
257 information non-repudiation and authenticity.

Примечание [AN11]: Perhaps not always “guarding against” but rather allowing for detection of change.

258 – Ramachandran:

- 259 1. *DATA INTEGRITY*—A condition in which data has not been altered or destroyed in an
260 unauthorized manner
- 261 2. *Integrity* is a state of information that assure that it is accurate, complete, consistent
262 and has been protected from errors or unauthorized modification.
- 263 3. *integrity* refers to the resource is untampered with, uncorrupted and complete in all
264 its essential respects after the act of signature is carried out.

265 *levels of access*

266 – Igor Furgel: permission for a subject (a person, an IT component or a process acting on
267 behalf of them) to get a specified kind of access (e.g. write, read, etc.) to specified objects
268 (e.g. data, processes, information, other resources).

269 A successful *authentication* (along with other factors) can be a necessary condition for
270 granting a certain *access level*. The terms ‘access level’ and ‘authorization level’ are used
271 as synonyms in the context of the current Recommendation.

272 *levels of authentication*

273 – Aleksandr Sazonov: a synonym for *levels of qualification of authentication service*.

274 – Ramachandran: a guidance concerning control technologies, processes, and management
275 activities, as well as assurance criteria that should be used to mitigate authentication
276 threats in order to achieve the required level of security based on the sensitivity of data or
277 a service.

280 *non-repudiation*

281 – Eric E Cohen: the ability for a system to prove that a specific user and only that specific
282 user sent a message and that it hasn't been modified. A user cannot deny/repudiate that
283 they signed/sent a message.

284 **privacy**

Примечание [AN12]: Should we deal with "privacy" or "personal data" rather?

285 – Eric E Cohen (<http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/Documents/Glossary/glossary.pdf>):

287 Freedom from unauthorized intrusion or disclosure of information about an individual and
288 an organization.

Примечание [s13]: Eric E Cohen My *personal* interpretation includes information about both individuals (people) and organizations.

289 **signatory**

290 – Jari Salo (<http://www.uncitral.org/pdf/english/texts/electcom/ml-elecsig-e.pdf>):

291 a person that holds signature creation data and acts either on its own behalf or on behalf of the
292 person it represents.

293 – Igor Furgel (Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on
294 electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions):

295 a natural person who creates an *electronic signature*.

Код поля изменен

Примечание [IF14]: Not just acts, but creates an electronic signature

Примечание [AN15]: Possibly only "creates", not necessarily "acts on behalf".

Удалено: *stamping*

296 **time stamp**

297 – Eric E Cohen: a trusted indication of when an action, particularly the application of a
298 digital signature, took place.

299 – Igor Furgel (Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on
300 electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions):

301 data in electronic form which binds other electronic data to a particular time establishing
302 evidence that these data existed at that time.

Примечание [s16]: Eric E Cohen Time stamping is vital in cryptography as people change roles and signatures expire; it is important to know whether the signature was valid and the signer was authorized or could be authenticated at the point of *signing* rather than the point of *checking*.

303 **transboundary trust space**

304 – Aleksandr Sazonov: a set of normative, organizational and technical conditions for
305 establishing trust in transboundary electronic interaction between public governmental
306 authorities, public non-budgetary funds, local authorities, organizations and citizens.

307 – Ramachandran: a technological and legal framework for trust establishment in
308 transboundary electronic informational interaction of entities in different legal
309 frameworks' subjects.

310 – Eurasian Economic Community Agreement: an aggregate of legal, organizational and
311 technical conditions, harmonized by the member-states in order to ensure trust in
312 international exchange of data and electronic documents between authorized bodies.

313 **what-you-see-is-what-you-sign**

314 – Aleksandr Sazonov: is a desirable property of electronic signature systems meaning that
315 the semantic interpretation of a electronically signed message cannot be changed, either
316 by accident or by intent.

317 **XML Signature**

318