CAMSS Assessment EIF Scenario v6.0.0

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

CAMSS Assessment EIF Scenario v6.0.0

Release Date: 14/04/2023

Scenario Version: 6.0.0

INTRODUCTION

COMMON ASSESSMENT
METHOD FOR
STANDARDS AND
SPECIFICATIONS

EIF Scenario

The European Interoperability Framework (EIF) provides guidance to public administrations on how to improve governance of their interoperability activities, establish cross-organisational relationships, streamline processes supporting end-to-end digital services, and ensure that existing and new legislation do not compromise interoperability efforts.

This CAMSS Scenario allows to assess the compliance of **interoperability specifications** with the EIF. The objective of the obtained assessment is to determine the suitability of the assessed interoperability specification for the delivery of interoperable European public services.

Background

CAMSS is the European guide for assessing and selecting standards and specifications for an eGovernment project, a reference when building an architecture, and an enabler for justifying the choice of standards and specifications in terms of interoperability needs and requirements. It is fully aligned with the European Standardisation Regulation 1025/2012.

The main objective of CAMSS is achieving interoperability and avoiding vendor lock-in by establishing a neutral and unbiased method for the assessment of technical specifications and standards in the field of ICT. This method will be compliant with Regulation 1025/2012 on European Standardisation.

While ICT solutions have specific characteristics at the political, legal, and organisational levels; semantic and technical interoperability are based mostly on technical specifications or standards. Within the context of the elaboration of their National Interoperability Frameworks, Member States organise the assessment of technical specifications or standards, in order to establish their national recommendations. Deciding on the recommended technical specifications or standards often calls for a resource-intensive and time-consuming assessment. In order to tackle this, the Digital Europe Programme (DEP) defines an action focused on the development of a common assessment method for standards and specifications (CAMSS).

The purpose of CAMSS is:

- to ensure that assessments of technical ICT specifications or standards and interoperability profiles are performed according to high and consistent standards;
- to ensure that assessments will contribute significantly to the confidence in the interoperability of systems implementing these specifications and profiles;
- to enable the reuse, in whole or in part, of such assessments;
- to continuously improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the assessment process for ICT technical specifications, standards, and interoperability profiles.

The expected benefits of the CAMSS are:

- Ensuring greater transparency throughout the selection of standards in the context of ICT strategies, architectures, and interoperability frameworks. This will be achieved through the establishment of a commonly agreed assessment method, assessment process, and a list of assessment attributes.

- Reducing resource and time requirements and avoiding duplication of efforts. (Partial) sharing of finalised assessments of standards and specifications.

- Allowing easier and faster assessments, and reusing the ones already performed through the creation and maintenance of a library of standards.

Your compliance level of the specification assessed depends on the scores you achieved in each section of the survey. Please see below the survey score conversion table below for guidance.

	Compliance Level				
Section	**Ad-hoc**	**Opportunistic**	**Essential**	**Sustainable**	**Seamless**
Principles setting the context for EU Actions on Interoperability	20	40	60	80	100
EIF Core Interoperability Principles	0 to 340	341 to 680	681 to 1020	1021 to 1360	1361 to 1700
EIF Principles Related to generic user needs and expectations	0 to 240	241 to 480	481 to 720	721 to 960	961 to 1200

EIF Foundation principles for cooperation among public administrations	0 to 100	101 to 200	201 to 300	301 to 400	401 to 500
EIF Interoperability Layers	0 to 200	201 to 400	401 to 600	601 to 800	801 to 1000

The following table shows the 'compliance levels' that a specification can reach depending on the assessment score.

Compliance Level	Description
Ad-hoc	Poor level of conformance with the EIF - The specification does not cover the requirements and recommendations set out by the EIF in this area.
Opportunistic	Fair level of conformance with the EIF - The specification barely covers the requirements and recommendations set out by the European Interoperability Framework in this area.
Essential	Essential level of conformance with the EIF - The specification covers the basic aspects set out in the requirements and recommendations from the European Interoperability Framework.
Sustainable	Good level of conformance with the EIF scenario - The specification covers all the requirements and recommendations set out by the European Interoperability Framework in this area.
Seamless	Leading practice of conformance level with the EIF - The specification fully covers the requirements and recommendations set out by the European Interoperability Framework in this area.

Contact: For any general or technical questions, please send an email to DIGIT-CAMSS@ec.europa.eu. Follow all activities related to the CAMSS on our CAMSS community page.

USER CONSENT

Disclaimer:

By no means will the Interoperability Specification assessment imply any endorsement of the EC to the assessed specification. Likewise, the use of CAMSS Assessment EIF Scenario implies that the user accepts that the EC is not liable on the assessment nor on any direct or indirect consequence/decision of such assesment.

The CAMSS Assessment EIF Scenario is based on EU Survey, by accepting the CAMSS Privacy Statement the user also accepts EU Survey Privacy Statement and the Terms of use.

* Please, fill in the mandatory* information to start the assessment

☑ *I have read and agreed to the following CAMSS Privacy Statement: here

☐ I agree to be contacted for evaluation purposes, namely to share my feedback on specific DEP solutions and actions and on the DEP programme and the European Interoperability Framework in general.

This assessment is licensed under the European Union Public License (EUPL)

IDENTIFICATION

Information on the information provider

Your Last name

CAMSS Team

Your First Name

Your Position / Role

* Your Organisation

European Comission DG-DIGIT

Your Contact phone number

* Would you like to be contacted for evaluation purposes in the context of your assessment? To see how your data is handled, please check again the Privacy statement here

In case you would like to be contacted, please select "yes" and provide your email.

○ Yes
◉ No

* Where did you learn about CAMSS?

○ DEP Programme (DEP website, DEP social media)
○ Joinup (e.g., CAMSS Collection, Joinup social media)
◉ European Commission
○ Public Administrations at national, regional or local level
○ Standards Developing Organizations (SDOs)
○ Other

If you answered "Other" in the previous question, please specify how:

Information on the specification

* Specification type

Specification: Set of agreed, descriptive, and normative statements about how a specification should be designed or made.
Standard: Specification that is largely adopted and possibly endorsed.
Application Profile: An application profile "customises one or more existing specifications potentially for a given use case or a policy domain adding an end to end narrative describing and ensuring the interoperability of its underlying specification(s)".
Family: A family is a collection of interrelated and/or complementary specifications, standards, or application profiles and the explanation of how they are combined, used, or both.

- 🔘 Specification
- ⚪ Standard
- ⚪ Application Profile
- ⚪ Family of Specification

* Title of the specification

Time-Stamp Protocol (TSP)

* Version of the specification

v1.0.0

* Description of the specification

The IETF 3161 Time-Stamp Protocol (also known as TSP) is a cryptographic protocol for certifying timestamps using X.509 certificates and public key infrastructure. The timestamp is the signer's assertion that a piece of electronic data existed at or before a particular time. Moreover, One of the major uses of time-stamping is to time-stamp a digital signature to prove that the digital signature was created before a given time.

* URL from where the specification is distributed

https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc5816

* Name and website of the standard developing/setting organisation (SDO/SSO) of the specification

- ⚪ W3C (https://www.w3.org)
- ⚪ OASIS (https://www.oasis-open.org/)
- ⚪ IEEE (https://standards.ieee.org/)
- ⚪ ETSI (https://www.etsi.org/)
- ⚪ GS1 (https://www.gs1.fr/)
- ⚪ openEHR (https://www.openehr.org/)

○ IETF (https://www.ietf.org/)

○ Other (SDO/SSO)

Contact information/contact person of the SDO

a) for the organisation

b) for the specification submitted

Information on the assessment of the specification

Reason for the submission, the need and intended use for the specification.

If any other evaluation of this specification is known, e.g. by Member States or European Commission projects, provide a link to this evaluation.

Considerations

Is the functional area of application for the formal specification addressing interoperability and eGovernment?

○ YES

○ NO

Additional Information

> The TSP specification can be useful for interoperability to get an unic system for e-signatures services. Therefore, electronic signatures are part of digital public services and can help to simplify and make more easy the relations between public administrations.

EIF PRINCIPLES SETTING THE CONTEXT FOR EU ACTIONS ON INTEROPERABILITY

This category is related to the first underlying principle (UP) of the EIF Subsidiarity and Proportionality (UP1). The basis of this principle is to ensure that the EU Actions are taken or stated to improve national actions or decisions. Specifically, it aims to know if National Interoperability Frameworks are aligned with the EIF.

Please note that some of the questions have a prefilled answer depending on the SDO. To ensure it, please see that these questions include a help message that remarks it.

Subsidiarity and Proportionality

---

* A1 - To what extent has the specification been included in a national catalogue from a Member State whose National Interoperability Framework has a high performance on interoperability according to National Interoperability Framework Observatory factsheets?

EIF Recommendation 1: Ensure that national interoperability frameworks and interoperability strategies are aligned with the EIF and, if needed, tailor and extend them to address the national context and needs.

This criterion assesses if the specifications have been included within the National Catalogues of Specifications of the Member States that are highly aligned with the higher level of performance in terms of interoperability.

The Digital Public Administration Factsheets use three categories to evaluate the level of National Interoperability frameworks in accordance with the EIF. The three categories are 1. CONCEPTUAL MODEL FOR INTEGRATED PUBLIC SERVICES PROVISION; 2 INTEROPERABILITY LAYERS, and 3. INTEROPERABILITY PRINCIPLES. National Interoperability Frameworks reports can be found here: https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/nifo-national-interoperability-framework-observatory/digital-public-administration-factsheets-2021

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ● The specification has not been included within the catalogue of any Member State.
- ○ The specification has been included within the catalogue of a Member State with a lower performance than stated in the Digital Public Administration Factsheets from the NIFO.
- ○ The specification has been included within the catalogue of a Member State with a middle-lower performance than stated in the Digital Public Administration Factsheets from the NIFO.
- ○ The specification has been included within the catalogue of a Member State with a middle-upper performance than stated in the Digital Public Administration Factsheets from the NIFO.
- ○ The specification has been included within the catalogue of a Member State with a higher performance than stated in the Digital Public Administration Factsheets from the NIFO.

* Justification

> TSP is not included in any national catalogue of recommended specifications whose Member State NIF is fully aligned with at least 2 out of 3 sections of the EIF according to NIFO factsheets.
>
> CAMSS List of Standards:
> https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/common-assessment-method-standards-and-specifications-camss/camss-list-standards

EIF CORE INTEROPERABILITY PRINCIPLES

In this category, elements related to the core interoperability principles (UP) are encompassed, which are: openness (UP 2), transparency (UP3), reusability (UP4), technological neutrality and data portability (UP5).

Openness

---

* A2 - Does the specification facilitate the publication of data on the web?

EIF Recommendation 2: Publish the data you own as open data unless certain restrictions apply.

Relates to the ability of the specification to publish data as open data or not.

- ○ Not Answered
- ● Not Applicable
- ○ The specification does not support the publication of data on the web.
- ○ The specification supports the publication of data on the web but under a non-open license.
- ○ The specification supports the publication of data on the web with an open license, but in an unstructured format.
- ○ The specification supports publication of data on the web with an open license and in a structured, machine-readable format.
- ○ In addition to the previous question, the specification does not require proprietary software for the processing of its related data.
- ○ In addition to the previous question, the specification is or incorporates open standards (e.g. W3C).

* Justification

> The purpose of the specification is not related to the publication of public data as Open Data. Therefore this criterion is not applicable to the specification.
>
> TSP Specification:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

* A3 - To what extent do stakeholders have the opportunity to contribute to the development of the specification?

EIF Recommendation 3: Ensure a level playing field for open-source software and demonstrate active and fair consideration of using open source software, taking into account the total cost of ownership of the solution.

Relates to in which measure the different stakeholders that a specification can benefit have the opportunity to participate in the working groups focused on the development of certain specifications.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ There is no information on the working group of the specification.
- ○ The working group is open to participation by any stakeholder but requires registration, fees, and membership approval.
- ○ The working group is open to participation by any stakeholder but requires fees and membership approval.
- ○ The working group is open to participation following a registration process.
- ● The working group is open to all without specific fees, registration, or other conditions.

IETF has a formal review and approval so that all the relevant stakeholders can formally appeal or raise objections to the development and approval of specifications.

Each distinct version of an Internet standards-related specification is published as part of the "Request for Comments" (RFC) document series. This archival series is the official publication channel for Internet standards documents and other publications.

During the development of a specification, draft versions of the document are made available for informal review and comment by placing them in the IETF's "Internet-Drafts" directory, which is replicated on a number of Internet hosts. This makes an evolving working document readily available to a wide audience, facilitating the process of review and revision.

Standard process IETF:
https://www.ietf.org/standards/process/

Internet Best Current Practices IETF:
https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2026

Additional Information

In case you need to add further justification.

---

* A4 - To what extent is a public review part of the release lifecycle?

EIF Recommendation 3: Ensure a level playing field for open-source software and demonstrate active and fair consideration of using open source software, taking into account the total cost of ownership of the solution.

A public review consists of the public availability of the specification's draft for stakeholders to provide inputs for the improvement and fix of possible bugs.

- ⊙ Not Answered
- ⊙ Not Applicable
- ⊙ Specification releases do not foresee public reviews.
- ⊙ Public review is applied to certain releases depending on the involved changes.
- ⊙ All major releases foresee a public review.
- ⊙ All major and minor releases foresee a public review but, during which, collected feedback is not publicly visible.
- ⦿ All major and minor releases foresee a public review during which collected feedback is publicly visible.

Justification:
The IETF is a consensus-based group, and authority to act on behalf of the community requires a high degree of consensus and the continued consent of the community. The process of creating and Internet Standard is straightforward: a specification undergoes a period of development and several iterations of review by the Internet community and revision based upon experience, is adopted as a Standard by the appropriate body... and is published. In practice, the process is more complicated, due to (1) the difficulty of creating specifications of high technical quality; (2) the need to consider the interests of all the affected parties; (3) the importance of establishing widespread community consensus; and (4) the difficulty of evaluating the utility of a particular specification for the Internet community. The goals of the Internet Standards Process are:

- Technical excellence;
- prior implementation and testing;
- clear, concise, and easily understood documentation;
- openness and fairness; and
- timeliness.

The goal of technical competence, the requirement for prior implementation and testing, and the need to allow all interested parties to comment all require significant time and effort. The Internet Standards Process is intended to balance these conflicting goals. The process is believed to be as short and simple as possible without sacrificing technical excellence, thorough testing before adoption of a standard, or openness and fairness.

Standard process IETF:
https://www.ietf.org/standards/process/

Additional Information
In case you need to add further justification.

---

* A5 - To what extent do restrictions and royalties apply to the specification's use?

EIF Recommendation 3: Ensure a level playing field for open-source software and demonstrate active and fair consideration of using open source software, taking into account the total cost of ownership of the solution.

Additionally to the EIF's recommendation that refers to open-source software it applies to a specification in itself at any interoperability level (legal, organisational, semantic, or technical)

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification has no public definition of its Intellectual Property Right (IPR) policy or licence.
- ○ Use of the specification is restricted and requires the payment of royalty fees.
- ○ Use of the specification is royalty-free but imposes an Intellectual Property Right (IPR) policy or licence that goes against Fair, Reasonable and Non-Discriminatory (F/RAND) principles.
- ● Use of the specification is royalty-free and its Intellectual Property Right (IPR) policy or licence is aligned with Fair, Reasonable and Non-Discriminatory (F/RAND) principles.

Justification:
Like all the IETF standards, this specification is a free and open technical specification, built on IETF standards and licenses from the Open Web Foundation. Therefore it is licensed on a royalty-free basis. No IPR disclosures have been submitted directly on this RFC.

Intellectual Property Rights in IETF:
https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc8179

Additional Information
In case you need to add further justification.

* A6 - To what extent is the specification sufficiently mature for its use in the development of digital solutions/services?

EIF Recommendation 4: Give preference to open specifications, taking due account of the coverage of functional needs, maturity and market support, and innovation.

Maturity related to the stability of the specification, meaning that it has been evolved enough and mechanisms for its development have been put in place (Change Management processes, monitoring, etc.)

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification has no published releases and no publicly accessible information on its development state.
- ○ The specification is under development without published releases.
- ○ The specification is under development with published preview releases.
- ○ The specification has published major releases but without public documentation on its supporting processes (e.g. change management and release management).
- ● The specification, in addition to having major releases available, has published documentation on its supporting processes (e.g. change management and release management).

* Justification

> Time-Stamp Protocol (TSP) was defined in 2001 and is a cryptographic protocol for certifying timestamps using X.509 certificates and public key infrastructure. Moreover the IETF has published all documentation about TSP in the web. Therefore, it is demonstrated that TSP has enough maturity for its use in the development of products and services.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

* A7 - To what extent has the specification sufficient market acceptance for its use in the development of digital solutions/services?

EIF Recommendation 4: Give preference to open specifications, taking due account of the coverage of functional needs, maturity and market support, and innovation.

Relates to how the specification is supported by the market, taking as a reference whether or not the specifications are widely used or implemented. There is an exception, and it is when the specification is used to implement innovative solutions, then, the specification should not be considered as failing to meet the requirements of the criterion.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ There is no information about the specification's market uptake.
- ○ The specification has known implementations but not enough to indicate market acceptance.
- ○ The specification has widespread use indicating market acceptance.
- ○ The specification has widespread use and relevant independent reports proving its market acceptance.
- ● The specification does not have market acceptance because it is directly used to create innovative solutions.

* Justification

> The RFC 3161 Time-Stamp Protocol (TSP) is widely used and involved in e-Signature services. This electronic signatures are part of digital public services, and also private in order to focus the development of digital environments avoiding the non-digital transactions. Moreover, the TSP has been adopted by many

countries and the European Union for initiatives and projects.

TSP IETF reference:
https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

DigiStamp:
https://www.digistamp.com/

FreeTSA:
https://www.freetsa.org/index_en.php

* A8 - To what extent has the specification support from at least one community?

EIF Recommendation 3: Ensure a level playing field for open-source software and demonstrate active and fair consideration of using open source software, taking into account the total cost of ownership of the solution.

Related to whether or not communities exist around the specification at any level legal, organisational, semantic, or technical contributions to its enhancement and development.

- ◉ Not Answered
- ◉ Not Applicable
- ◉ There is no community linked to the specification.
- ◉ Specification support is available but as part of a closed community requiring registration and possibly fees.
- ◉ There is no specific community to support the specification but there are public channels for the exchange of help and knowledge among its users.
- ◉ There is a community providing public support linked to the specification but in a best-effort manner.
- ⦿ There is a community tasked to provide public support linked to the specification and manage its maintenance.

* Justification

TSP is developed and maintained by IETF, a widely recognised open international community developing standards to enhance the internet.

IETF Reference:
https://www.ietf.org/

TSP IETF reference:
https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

Transparency

* A9 - To what extent does the specification enable the visibility of administrative procedures, rules data, and services?

EIF Recommendation 5: Ensure internal visibility and provide external interfaces for European public services.

- ◉ Not Answered
- ◉ Not Applicable
- ◉ The specification hinders visibility.

○ The specification neither promotes nor hinders visibility.

○ The specification can contribute and promote the visibility of administrations, but it is not its main purpose.

○ The specification can enable the visibility of administrations if combined with other specifications.

◉ The specification actively promotes and supports visibility.

* Justification

> In those procedures where it's crucial to have a clear record of when certain actions were taken or when documents were modified, TSP can be a good visibility enabler given its capability to assig timestamps to each event or change, allowing administrators to create a detailed and verifiable log of the sequence of actions. This log can then be used to review procedures, and maintain historical records.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

* A10 - To what extent does the specification scope comprehensibly administrative procedures, rules data, and services?

EIF Recommendation 5: Ensure internal visibility and provide external interfaces for European public services.

○ Not Answered

◉ Not Applicable

○ The specification hinders comprehensibility.

○ The specification neither promotes nor hinders comprehensibility.

○ The specification can contribute and promote the comprehensibility of administrations, but it is not its main purpose.

○ The specification can scope the comprehensibility of administrations if combined with other specifications.

○ The specification actively promotes and supports comprehensibility.

* Justification

> The purpose of the specifications is not related to the comprehensibility of administrative information, data or services. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable to this specification.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

* A11 - To what extent does the specification enable the exposure of interfaces to access the public administration's services?

EIF Recommendation 5: Ensure internal visibility and provide external interfaces for European public services.

Relates to ensuring availability of interfaces with internal information systems. As the EIF defines: Public administrations operate a large number of what are often heterogeneous and disparate information systems in support of their internal processes. Interoperability depends on ensuring the availability of interfaces to these systems and the data they handle. In turn, interoperability facilitates the reuse of systems and data and enables these to be integrated into larger systems.

○ Not Answered

◉ Not Applicable

○ The specification prevents the exposure of such interfaces.

○ The specification neither promotes nor hinders the exposure of such interfaces.

○ The specification can contribute to the exposure of interfaces, but it is not its main purpose.

○ The specification can enable the exposure of interfaces if combined with other specifications.

○ The specification enables exposure of such interfaces.

* Justification

> The purpose of the specifications is not related to the availability of interfaces with internal information systems. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable to this specification.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

Reusability

* A12 - To what extent is the specification usable beyond the business-specific domain, allowing its usage across business domains?

EIF Recommendation 6: Reuse and share solutions, and cooperate in the development of joint solutions when implementing European public services.

Relates to the use of the specification beyond a specific business domain. E.g. a specification developed under the eHealth domain that can be used in other domains or not.

○ Not Answered

○ Not Applicable

○ The specification is tied to a specific domain and is restricted from being implemented or used in other domains.

○ The specification is associated with a specific domain but its implementation and/or use in other domains is difficult.

○ The specification is associated with a specific domain but could be partially implemented and/or used in other domains.

○ The specification is associated with a specific domain but could be implemented and/or used 'as-is' to other domains.

● The specification is domain-agnostic, designed to be implemented and/or used in any domain.

* Justification

> TSP is a business domain agnostic specification that can be applied in any field requiring the management of transaction orders and ensuring data consistency.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

Technological Neutrality and Data Portability

* A13 - Is the specification technology agnostic?

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ NO
- ◉ YES

* Justification

> TSP can be implemented in any platform and it is independent of any technology.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

*** A14 - Is the specification platform agnostic?**

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ NO
- ◉ YES

* Justification

> TSP can be implemented in any platform and it is independent of any platform.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

*** A15 - To what extent does the specification allow for partial implementations?**

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification is only meant to be used as a whole.
- ○ The specification could be partially implemented but does not make specific provisions towards this.

○ The specification could be partially implemented but includes only guidelines towards this rather than sets of requirements.
○ The specification explicitly foresees sets of requirements that can be implemented incrementally.
● The specification explicitly foresees sets of requirements that can be implemented incrementally or separately.

* Justification

> TSP can be partially implemented depending on specific needs and constraints of a system. It is flexible enough to be used in scenarios where only certain aspects of transaction management require timestamp-based ordering, allowing for tailored applications that address specific concurrency or consistency issues without fully implementing the protocol across all system operations.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161
>
> Weisser Zwerg implementations reference:
> https://weisser-zwerg.dev/posts/trusted_timestamping/#free-implementations

* A16 - Does the specification allow customisation?

EIF Recommendation 8: Do not impose any technological solutions on citizens, businesses, and other administrations that are technology-specific or disproportionate to their real needs.

A clear example of customizations is Core Vocabularies, which define a set of general requirements that could fit in any context and allow for the customization to fit specific business requirements in the implementation.

○ Not Answered
○ Not Applicable
○ NO
● YES

* Justification

> Customizing timestamping protocols involves setting up a publicly available, trusted timestamp management infrastructure. Moreover, this infrastructure collects, processes, and renews timestamps, and there is a list of schemes that offer customisation.
>
> The Security Evaluation of Time Stamping Schemes: The Present Situation and Studies:
> https://www.imes.boj.or.jp/research/papers/english/01-E-18.pdf
>
> Timestamp based Concurrency Control:
> https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/timestamp-based-concurrency-control/

* A17 - Does the specification allow extension?

EIF Recommendation 8: Do not impose any technological solutions on citizens, businesses, and other administrations that are technology-specific or disproportionate to their real needs.

A clear example of extension is Core Vocabularies, which are a set of general requirements fitting in different contexts that can complement each other in a sort of extensibility practice to fit specific business requirements in any implementation.

○ Not Answered

○ Not Applicable

○ NO

● YES

* Justification

> There are extensions avilable for RFC3161. One of the extensions is ANSI X9.95, which specifies the minimum security requirements for the effective use of time stamps in a financial services environment.
>
> ANSI X9.95 reference:
> https://webstore.ansi.org/standards/ascx9/ansix9952022

A18 - To what extent does the specification enable data portability between systems/applications supporting the implementation or evolution of European public services?

EIF Recommendation 9: Ensure data portability, namely that data is easily transferable between systems and applications supporting the implementation and evolution of European public services without unjustified restrictions, if legally possible.

○ Not Answered

● Not Applicable

○ The specification prevents or does not support data portability.

○ The specification neither addresses data portability nor prevents it.

○ The specification addresses data portability but without specific provisions to enable it.

○ The specification introduces certain aspects that can contribute to enabling data portability.

○ The specification explicitly addresses and enables data portability.

* Justification

> The specification is a protocol focused on the transaction of data, specifically on the certification of certain data, information or documents which either exist or not. Despite its relation to the data exchange, the specification is not related to data portability itself, but the trustworthy data exchange amongst Systems and European Public Services.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

EIF PRINCIPLES RELATED TO GENERIC USER NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS

This category includes all underlying principles from the EIF which are related to user needs. Principles included here are user-centricity (UP6), inclusion and accessibility (UP7), security and privacy (UP8), and multilingualism (UP9).

User-Centricity

* A19 - To what extent does the specification allow relevant information to be reused when needed?

EIF Recommendation 13: As far as possible under the legislation in force, ask users of European public services once-only and relevant-only information.

The Once-Only Principle is related to making the operations or transactions between administrations and stakeholders more efficient. It implies avoiding the provision of certain data or information twice or more when this information is already available for public administrations.
First European Data Space, Once Only Technical System (OOTS):
https://ec.europa.eu/digital-building-blocks/wikis/display/DIGITAL/Once+Only+Technical+System
Additional and relevant information can be found here: https://ec.europa.eu/cefdigital/wiki/display/CEFDIGITAL/Once+Only+Principle

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ Information needs to be provided whenever this is needed.
- ○ There is limited reuse of provided information.
- ○ Provided information is reused, but this is not consistently done.
- ○ Provided information is reused, but not in all scenarios.
- ◉ Information is provided once-only and reused as needed.

* Justification

> One of the main features of the TSP is that it allows for the maintenance of accurate and consistent timestamps, thus helping in creating a reliable record of data changes and states over time. Users, therefore, can access historical data effectively and ensures that any reused information reflects its proper sequence and integrity. Allowing the reuse of existing data that has been certified, the specification can avoid administrations asking for same certified references in procurement, for instance.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

Inclusion and Accessibility

* A20 - To what extent does the specification enable the e-accessibility?

EIF Recommendation 14: Ensure that all European public services are accessible to all citizens, including persons with disabilities, the elderly, and other disadvantaged groups. For digital public services, public administrations should comply with e-accessibility specifications that are widely recognised at the European or international level.

Examples of specifications addressing e-accessibility are, for instance, WAI-ARIA (https://www.w3.org/WAI/standards-guidelines/aria/) included within Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) Overview (https://www.w3.org/WAI/standards-guidelines/wcag/).

- ○ Not Answered
- ◉ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification prevents or does not support e-accessibility.
- ○ The specification neither addresses e-accessibility nor prevents it.
- ○ The specification can contribute and promote e-accessibility, but it is not its main purpose.
- ○ The specification can enable e-accessibility if combined with other specifications.

◎   The specification explicitly addresses and enables e-accessibility.

* Justification

> The purpose of TSP is not related to e-accessibility. Therefore, this criterion is considered not applicable specification.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

Privacy

* A21 - To what extent does the specification ensure the protection of personal data managed by Public Administrations?

EIF Recommendation 15: Define common security and privacy framework and establish processes for public services to ensure secure and trustworthy data exchange between public administrations and in interactions with citizens and businesses.

Relates to the actions that Public Administrations establish concerning sensitive information for the proper delivery of public services. The different actions imply the reception, classification, and exchange of such information.

Securing the right to the protection of personal data, by respecting the applicable legal framework for the large volumes of personal data of citizens, held and managed by Public administrations.

◎ Not Answered
◎ Not Applicable
◎ The specification hinders the protection of personal data.
◎ The specification does not address the protection of personal data but neither prevents it.
◎ The specification includes certain data protection considerations but without being exhaustive.
◎ The specification explicitly addresses data protection but without referring to relevant regulations.
◉ The specification explicitly addresses data protection and its alignment to relevant regulations.

* Justification

> TSA can be used to protect data using Time-Stamp Tokens and making documentation accessible only to certain requesters, who could be public administrations in this case. Therefore, TSP can help to ensure the protection of personal data managed by Pubic Administrations.
>
> TSP/TSA IETF reference:
> https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3161

* A22 - Does the specification provide means for restriction of access to information/data?

EIF Recommendation 15: Define common security and privacy framework and establish processes for public services to ensure secure and trustworthy data exchange between public administrations and in interactions with citizens and businesses.

The principle of confidentiality defines that only the sender and the intended recipient(s) must be able to create the content of a message. Confidentiality have compromised if an unauthorized person is able to create a message.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification prevents or does not support the implementation of confidentiality mechanisms/features.
- ○ The specification neither addresses confidentiality nor prevents it.
- ○ The specification addresses confidentiality but without specific provisions to enable it.
- ● The specification introduces certain aspects that can contribute to enabling confidentiality.
- ○ The specification explicitly addresses and enables the implementation of features to guarantee confidentiality.

* Justification

> The TSA is a TTP that creates time-stamp tokens in order to indicate that a datum existed at a particular point in time. In this way, TSP can contribute to improving secure loggins, as well as integrating with security protocols to improve confidenciality. Some of these mechanisms that can help guarantee the confidentiality of data are TLS or SASL.
>
> TSP/TSA IETF reference:
> https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3161
>
> TLS cloudfare reference:
> https://www.cloudflare.com/learning/ssl/transport-layer-security-tls/
>
> SASL gnu reference:
> https://www.gnu.org/software/gsasl/manual/gsasl.html#SASL-Overview

* **A23 - Is the specification included in any initiative at European or National level covering privacy aspects?**

EIF Recommendation 15: Define common security and privacy framework and establish processes for public services to ensure secure and trustworthy data exchange between public administrations and in interactions with citizens and businesses.

Securing the right to the protection of personal data, by respecting the applicable legal framework for the large volumes of personal data of citizens, held and managed by Public administrations.

Relates to the actions that Public Administrations establish concerning sensitive information for the proper delivery of public services. The different actions imply the reception, classification, and exchange of such information.

For example, the ETSI (Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures) family of specifications are part of the trust establishment of the eDelivery solution, ensuring that its implementation is salient to guarantee security and privacy.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ Yes, but at national or regional level.
- ● Yes, at European level.

* Justification

21

TSP is mentioned at "Commision decision of 25 February 2011 establishing minimum requirements for the cross-border processing of documents signed electronically by competent authorities under Directive 2006/123/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on services in the internal market". In this document it is metioned that States should implement technical means which support signed documents in BES or EPES format. One of the technical means mentioned is TSP.

Commision decision referene:
https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32011D0130&qid=1714025936203#ntc6-L_2011053ES.01006801-E0006

Security

Data processing and exchange

* A24 - To what extent does the specification enable the secure exchange of data?

EIF Recommendation 15: Define common security and privacy framework and establish processes for public services to ensure secure and trustworthy data exchange between public administrations and in interactions with citizens and businesses.

This relates to the actions that Public Administrations establish concerning sensitive information for the proper delivery of public services. The different actions imply the reception, classification, and exchange of such information.

- ◎ Not Answered
- ◎ Not Applicable
- ◎ The specification prevents or does not support the secure and trustworthy exchange of data.
- ◎ The specification introduces certain aspects that can contribute to enabling the secure exchange of data.
- ◎ The specification addresses data security and trustworthy data exchange but does not foresee specific provisions to enable them.
- ⦿ The specification addresses data security and trustworthy data exchange but specific provisions to enable them are limited.
- ◎ The specification explicitly addresses and enables the secure and trustworthy exchange of data.

* Justification

While TSP itself does not encrypt or secure data, it provides an essential layer of trust and verification to data transactions, enhancing security when integrated with other security measures. The examples below demonstrate how adding reliable timestamps to data operations supports the secure exchange of information by ensuring transparency, accountability, and the integrity of data records.

TSP IETF reference:
https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

* A25 - To what extent does the specification enable the secure processing of data?

EIF Recommendation 15: Define common security and privacy framework and establish processes for public services to ensure secure and trustworthy data exchange between public administrations and in interactions with citizens and businesses.

Relates to the actions that Public Administrations establish concerning sensitive information for the proper delivery of public services. The different actions imply the reception, classification, and exchange of such information.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification prevents or does not support the secure and trustworthy processing of data.
- ○ The specification introduces certain aspects that can contribute to enabling the secure processing of data.
- ○ The specification addresses data security and trustworthy data processing but does not foresee specific provisions to enable them.
- ○ The specification addresses data security and trustworthy data processing but specific provisions to enable them are limited.
- ● The specification explicitly addresses and enables the secure and trustworthy processing of data.

* Justification

> TSP can use TSA whose role is to time-stamp a datum to establish evidence indicating that a datum existed before a particular time. This can then be used, for example, to verify that a digital signature was applied to a message before the corresponding certificate was revoked thus allowing a revoked public key certificate to be used for verifying signatures created prior to the time of revocation. Moreover, it provides a verifiable order of transactions, which is crucial for detecting unauthorised changes and supporting audits. While not encrypting data, when combined with other security measures like encryption, it strengthens overall data protection, especially in regulated environments like finance and healthcare.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3161
>
> "Timestamp Authentication Protocol for RemoteMonitoring in eHealth" reference:
> https://www.researchgate.net/publication
> /4352969_Timestamp_Authentication_Protocol_for_Remote_Monitoring_in_eHealth

Data authenticity

* **A26 - To what extent the specification guarantees the authenticity and authentication of the roles agents involved in the data transactions?**

EIF Recommendation 15: Define common security and privacy framework and establish processes for public services to ensure secure and trustworthy data exchange between public administrations and in interactions with citizens and businesses.

Authentication defines that users are who they request to be. Availability defines that resources are available by authorized parties; "denial of service" attacks, which are the subject matter of national news, are attacks against availability. The concerns of information security professionals are access control and Nonrepudiation. Authorization defines the power that it can have over distinguishing authorized users from unauthorized users, and levels of access in-between. Authenticity defines the constant checks that it can have to run on the system to make sure sensitive places are protected and working perfectly."

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification prevents or does not support the implementation of authentication features.
- ○ The specification neither addresses authenticity nor prevents it.
- ○

The specification addresses the implementation of authenticity features but without specific provisions to enable it.

◯ The specification introduces certain aspects that can contribute to enabling authenticity features.

◉ The specification explicitly addresses and enables the implementation of authenticity features.

* Justification

> The Time Stamping Protocol (TSP), utilizing TSA authentication mechanisms, can enable entities to access certain fields or restrict access, and validate signatures with Time-Stamp Tokens. The assignation of precise timestamps to each transaction or data modification ensures that the sequence and timing of data changes are accurately recorded. This is an important capability for establishing when data was altered or accessed, which can help verify its authenticity.
>
> TSP/TSA IETF reference:
> https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3161

Data integrity

* A27 - To what extent information is protected against unauthorised changes?

EIF Recommendation 15: Define common security and privacy framework and establish processes for public services to ensure secure and trustworthy data exchange between public administrations and in interactions with citizens and businesses.

Integrity defines that information is protected against unauthorized changes that are not perceptible to authorized users; some incidents of hacking compromise the integrity of databases and multiple resources.

◯ Not Answered

◯ Not Applicable

◯ The specification prevents or does not support the implementation of data integrity mechanisms /features.

◯ The specification neither addresses data integrity nor prevents it.

◉ The specification addresses data integrity but without specific provisions to enable it.

◯ The specification introduces certain aspects that can contribute to enabling data integrity.

◯ The specification explicitly addresses and enables the implementation of features to guarantee data integrity.

* Justification

> Time Stamp Authority guarantee that the data has not been subjected to any form of unauthorized modification, thereby ensuring the integrity of the information in question. While TSP is a tool that can enhance data integrity and provide audit trails, it primarily helps in detecting unauthorized changes rather than preventing them. For comprehensive protection, it should be integrated into a broader security framework that includes preventive, detective, and corrective controls.
>
> Emudhra TSP reference:
> https://emudhra.com/blog/what-is-timestamping
>
> TSP/TSA IETF reference:
> https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3161

Data accuracy

* A28 - To what extent does the specification ensure and enable data processing accuracy?

EIF Recommendation 15: Define common security and privacy framework and establish processes for public services to ensure secure and trustworthy data exchange between public administrations and in interactions with citizens and businesses.

The accuracy and completeness of information systems and the data supported within the systems should be an administration concern. The information which has been inappropriately changed or destroyed (by external or employees) can impact the organization. Each organization should make controls to provide that data entered into and saved in its automated files and databases are complete and accurate and provide the accuracy of disseminated data.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification prevents or does not support the implementation of data accuracy mechanisms/features.
- ○ The specification neither addresses data accuracy nor prevents it.
- ○ The specification addresses data accuracy but without specific provisions to enable it.
- ● The specification introduces certain aspects that can contribute to enabling data accuracy.
- ○ The specification explicitly addresses and enables the implementation of features to guarantee data accuracy.

* Justification

> The role of TSA is to time-stamp a datum to establish evidence indicating that a datum existed before a particular time. But the TSA can also be used to indicate the time of submission when a deadline is critical, or to indicate the time of transaction for entries in a log. However, for direct data accuracy, it should be complemented with validation checks, error correction algorithms, and quality control processes to ensure correctness and precision of data.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3161

Access Control

* A29 - To what extent does the specification provide an access control mechanism?

EIF Recommendation 15: Define common security and privacy framework and establish processes for public services to ensure secure and trustworthy data exchange between public administrations and in interactions with citizens and businesses.

The principle of access control decides who must be able to access what. For example, it must be able to define that user A can view the data in a database, but cannot refresh them. User A can be allowed to create updates as well. An access-control mechanism can be installed to provide this. Access control is associated with two areas including role management and rule management. Role management applies on the user side, whereas rule management targets the resources side.

- ○ Not Answered
- ● Not Applicable
- ○ The specification does not provide access control mechanisms.
- ○ The specification neither addresses nor prevents access control mechanisms.
- ○ The specification addresses access control mechanisms but without specific provisions to enable them.
- ○ The specification introduces certain aspects that can contribute to enabling access control mechanisms.

○ The specification explicitly foresees a set of requirements for the enabling of access control mechanisms.

* Justification

> TSP is not adressed to access control mechanisms, although it can indirectly help improve them through verification processes and audit trails.
>
> TSP/TSA reference:
> https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3161

Multilingualism

* A30 - To what extent could the specification be used in a multilingual context?

EIF Recommendation 16: Use information systems and technical architectures that cater to multilingualism when establishing a European public service. Decide on the level of multilingualism support based on the needs of the expected users.

- ○ Not Answered
- ⦿ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification cannot be used in a multilingual context.
- ○ The specification could be used in a multilingual context but has no specific provisions to facilitate this.
- ○ The specification foresees limited support for multilingualism.
- ○ The specification foresees support for multilingualism but this is not complete.
- ○ The specification is designed to fully support multilingualism.

* Justification

> The purpose of TSP is not related to the delivery of multilingual public services. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable to the specification.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

EIF FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES FOR COOPERATION AMONG PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIONS

This category includes the criteria aiming to evaluate principles related to collaboration amongst public organisations, business, and citizens. This is related to the underlying principles of administrative simplification (UP10), preservation of information (UP11), and assessment of effectiveness and efficiency (UP12).

Administrative Simplification

* A31 - Does the specification simplify the delivery of European public services?

EIF Recommendation 17: Simplify processes and use digital channels whenever appropriate for the delivery of European public services, to respond promptly and with high quality to users' requests and reduce the administrative burden on public administrations, businesses and citizens.

A positive answer would cover every specification easing digitalisation and administratice simplification by for example helping an Identification service access a Digital Portfolo with citizens information.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ NO
- ● YES

* Justification

> TSP tracks the creation and modification time of digital documents. Therefore, it fosters the creation and digitalisation of services at the same time that guarantees the data trustworthy exchange. By providing these capabilities to administrations, allows the reduction of administrative burden avoiding non-digital exchanges and the procedures for ensuring data reliability.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

* A32 - Does the specification enable digital service delivery channels?

EIF Recommendation 17: Simplify processes and use digital channels whenever appropriate for the delivery of European public services, to respond promptly and with high quality to users' requests and reduce the administrative burden on public administrations, businesses and citizens.

A positive answer would cover that a specification eases or provides better means of delivering public services as a good asset for digitalisation and administrative simplification. For instance, a specification directly related to API performance easing and improving the delivery of a Digital Public Service through an API.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ NO
- ● YES

* Justification

> TSP enables digital service delivery channels in many ways among which we could highlight the maintenance of the data integrity, facilitation of compliance to regulaory requirements or enhancing security in transactions, that is why they are used in document and records management system.
> The Ministry of economic and transformation Digital has a TSA, which is synchronized with the royal navy Observatory. One of the services available in the TSA is "resellado request", which preserves the longevity of the validity of the seals generated on the official or transactions, guaranteeing security and trustworthy of data.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3161
>
> "Beijing platform for time-stamping TSA" reference:
> https://administracionelectronica.gob.es/ctt/tsa/infoadicional

Preservation of Information

---

* A33 - To what extent does the specification enable the long-term preservation of data/information /knowledge (electronic records included)?

Relates to the capacity of the specification to contribute to the long-term preservation of information.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification prevents or does not support long-term preservation.
- ○ The specification neither addresses the long-term preservation nor prevents it.
- ○ The specification addresses the long-term preservation of electronic resources (information, data, etc) in a limited manner.
- ○ The specification addresses long-term preservation of electronic resources (information, data, etc), but not in a complete manner.
- ● The specification explicitly addresses and enables long-term preservation.

* Justification

> The specification is used for the certification of time-stamps, which provides information about the creation or modifications of certain documentation or data, it can be used when archiving electronic records as a manner to preserve the integrity of such data. Therefore, the IETF 3161 Time Stamp Protocol (TSP) fosters the preservation of electronic documents by providing a mechanism for clearly identify time stamps for these electronic documents.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

Assessment of Effectiveness and Efficiency

---

* A34 - To what extent are there assessments of the specification's effectiveness?

Related to the degree to which the specification is effective while using it. There are indirect methods to determine that the specification is effective, for instance when a solution that has an effective performance and uses the specification to deliver the expected service.

Effectiveness: *the extent to which the specifications reach the expected action according to its purpose.*

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ There are no such assessments.
- ○ There are such assessments that indirectly address the specification.

○ There are such assessments evaluating digital solutions' effectiveness that involve the specification.

○ There are such assessments addressing the specification and its effectiveness together with other specifications.

⦿ There are such assessments directly addressing the specification.

* Justification

There are several studies and documentation analysing the use of the IETF Time Stamp Protocol with different purposes and putting emphasis on its usage as an efficient way to implement Time-stamp services.
In "Design and Implementation of a RFC3161-Enhanced Time-Stamping Service" it is designed and implemented a RFC3161-compliant trusted time-stamping service (TTS) over the Internet.
Moreover, in "Study about the impementation of Secure Time Stamp Device", it is discussed the design of a Secure Time Stamp device used to securely timestamp digital data, such as computer documents, files, and raw binary data of arbitrary format.

Design and Implementation of a RFC3161-Enhanced Time-Stamping Service:
https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.101.7115&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Study about the impementation of Secure Time Stamp Device:
https://www.sans.org/reading-room/whitepapers/vpns/analysis-secure-time-stamp-device-746

* **A35 - To what extent are there assessments of the specification's efficiency?**

EIF Recommendation 19: Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of different interoperability solutions and technological options considering user needs, proportionality, and balance between costs and benefits.

Related to the good use of time and resources not wasted unnecessarily by a specification being used. There are indirect methods to determine that the specification is efficient, for instance, a solution delivering a service with an efficient performance that uses the specification.

Efficiency: times and means needed to achieve the results using the specification.

○ Not Answered

○ Not Applicable

○ There are no such assessments.

○ There are such assessments that indirectly address the specification.

○ There are assessments evaluating digital solutions' efficiency that involve the specification.

○ There are such assessments addressing the specification and its efficiency together with other specifications.

⦿ There are such assessments directly addressing the specification.

* Justification

There are several studies and documentation analysing the use of the IETF Time Stamp Protocol with different purposes and putting emphasis on its usage as an efficient way to implement Time-stamp services.
In "Design and Implementation of a RFC3161-Enhanced Time-Stamping Service" it is designed and implemented a RFC3161-compliant trusted time-stamping service (TTS) over the Internet.
Moreover, in "Study about the impementation of Secure Time Stamp Device", it is discussed the design of a Secure Time Stamp device used to securely timestamp digital data, such as computer documents, files, and raw binary data of arbitrary format.

Design and Implementation of a RFC3161-Enhanced Time-Stamping Service:

EIF INTEROPERABILITY LAYERS

This category is aligned with the related interoperability models described in the EIF and apply to all the public services. It includes six layers: interoperability governance, integrated public service governance, legal interoperability, organisational interoperability, semantic interoperability, and technical interoperability covered by criteria A2 to A10 under the Openness category.

Interoperability Governance

* A36 - Is the (or could it be) specification mapped to the European Interoperability Architecture (EIRA)?

EIF Recommendation 20: Ensure holistic governance of interoperability activities across administrative levels and sectors.

The EIRA defines the required capabilities for promoting interoperability as a set of Architecture Building Blocks (ABBs). The association of specification to these ABBs means the capacity to enable Legal, Organisational, Semantic, or Technical aspects needed for the development of interoperable public services. This association can be taken from ELIS the EIRA Library of Interoperability Specifications (ELIS) but also can be established ad-hoc.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ NO
- ● YES

* Justification

> IETF 3161 Time Stamp Protocol (TSP) is already associated with EIRA ABBs in the European Library Of Specifications (ELIS). More specifically, IETF 3161 Time-Stamp Protocol (TSP) can define the interoperability aspects of the " e-Timestamp Creation Service", and "e-Timestamp Verification and Validation Service" ABBs of the EIRA Technical View.
>
> EIRA Library of Interoperability Specifications (ELIS):
> https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/common-assessment-method-standards-and-specifications-camss/solution/elis/distribution/elis-v600xlsx

* A37 - To what extent can the conformance of the specification's implementations be assessed?

EIF Recommendation 21: Put in place processes to select relevant standards and specifications, evaluate them, monitor their implementation, check compliance and test their interoperability.

Relates to the implementation of the specification being conformant with the requirements established in the text of the specification. There are different methods to ensure the conformance of an implementation: check manually if

the implementation meets the requirements in the specification text (if any), use additional methods or resources provided to this purpose or use specific tools provided by the SDO developing the specification.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ The specification does not include a definition of conformance.
- ○ The specification defines conformance but not as a set of measurable requirements.
- ○ The specification defines conformance as requirements that can be measured manually.
- ○ The specification defines conformance as requirements with resources to enable automated measurement.
- ● The specification is complemented by a conformance testing platform to allow testing of implementations.

* Justification

> Following the completion of the research into conformity tests and certifications, an open-source tool has been identified that enables the testing of implementations with time-stamping commands. This tool is designed to ensure that the implementations are developed in an appropriate manner.
>
> TSP certification tool:
> https://www.freetsa.org/index_en.php
>
> OpenSSL:
> https://www.openssl.org/docs/manmaster/man1/ts.html

* A38 - Is the specification recommended by a European Member State?

EIF Recommendation 23: Consult relevant catalogues of standards, specifications, and guidelines at the national and EU level, in accordance with your NIF and relevant DIFs, when procuring and developing ICT solutions.

Recommended specifications are these specifications that the Member States provide as examples for the implementation of certain digital public services or for being used when procuring these digital public services or solutions.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ NO
- ● YES

* Justification

> TSP is used in many European Member States, using TSA for time stamping services. One of the countries in which TSA is used is in Spain, where the sealing service allows electronic document stamps to be issued by the bodies supplying the service.
>
> CAMSS List of Standards:
> https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/common-assessment-method-standards-and-specifications-camss/camss-list-standards
>
> Spain TSA reference:
> https://administracionelectronica.gob.es/ctt/verIniciativaPInfoAdificional.htm?idIniciativa=tsa&idioma=en

* A39 - Is the specification selected for its use in a European Cross-border project/initiative?

The European Commission set up a process for the identification and assessment of specifications for its use in the development of IT solutions and also when procuring them. Find here the commission implementing decisions that include the specifications identified by the European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market/european-standards/ict-standardisation/ict-technical-specifications_en

Additionally, there could be other situations where a specification can be selected for European projects or initiatives out of the scope of the above-mentioned context. These specifications can be considered positively in this assessment.

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ NO
- ● YES

* Justification

> The European Union Agency For Network And Information Security includes within a set of guidelines for implementing qualified electronic time stamps. That means that the specification, as part of this set of guidelines, is recommended when handling Timestamps.
>
> ENISA Security guidelines on the appropriate use of qualified electronic time stamps: https://security.stackexchange.com/questions/173652/how-to-timestamp-a-document-without-electronic-signature-under-eidas

* A40 - Is the specification included in an open repository/catalogue of standards at national level?

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ● NO
- ○ YES

* Justification

> TSP is not included in any Member States' catalogues of recommended specifications.
>
> CAMSS List of Standards:
> https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/common-assessment-method-standards-and-specifications-camss/camss-list-standards

* A41 - Is the specification included in an open repository/catalogue of standards at European level?

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ○ NO
- ⦿ YES

* Justification

> The specification is included within the EIRA Interoperability Specification Library (ELIS) listed as a possible specification to be used for implementing two of EIRA's ABBs. Moreover, IETF 3161 Time Stamp Protocol (TSP) is considered as the basis of the European Standard Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Time-stamping protocol and time-stamp token profiles from ETSI. Within the document, it is recognised as the basis to which ETSI standard applied constraints.
>
> ETSI Catalogue:
> https://www.etsi.org/standards-search#Pre-defined%20Collections
>
> ETSI EN 319 422:
> Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI);
> Time-stamping protocol and time-stamp token profiles

Legal Interoperability

* A42 - Is the specification a European Standard?

- ○ Not Answered
- ○ Not Applicable
- ⦿ NO
- ○ YES

* Justification

> TSP is developed by IETF which is based in the USA. Therefore, the specification cannot be regarded as a European Standard.
>
> IETF reference:
> https://www.ietf.org/

Organisational Interoperability

* A43 - Does the specification facilitate the modelling of business processes?

EIF Recommendation 28: Document your business processes using commonly accepted modelling techniques and agree on how these processes should be aligned to deliver a European public service.

- ○ Not Answered
- ● Not Applicable
- ○ NO
- ○ YES

* Justification

> The purpose of TSP is not related to the modelling of business processes. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable to the specification.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

* A44 - To what extent does the specification facilitate organisational interoperability agreements?

EIF Recommendation 29: Clarify and formalise your organisational relationships for establishing and operating European public services.

Relates to specifications' capacities to help and ease the creation and formalisation of Interoperability agreements. E.g. Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs), Services Level Agreements (SLAs).

- ○ Not Answered
- ● Not Applicable
- ○ The specification's definition hinders the drafting of such agreements.
- ○ The specification makes no provisions that would facilitate the drafting of such agreements.
- ○ The specification defines certain elements to facilitate such agreements.
- ○ The specification defines most elements to facilitate such agreements.
- ○ The specification explicitly identifies all elements to be used in drafting such agreements.

* Justification

> The purpose of TSP is not related to organisational interoperability. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable to the specification.
>
> TSP IETF reference:
> https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3161

Semantic Interoperability

* A45 - Does the specification encourage the creation of communities along with the sharing of their data and results in national and/or European platforms?

- ◉ Not Answered
- ● Not Applicable
- ◉ Yes, but at national or regional level.
- ◉ Yes, at European platforms.

* Justification

> No forum or debate has been found that can contribute to the creation of communities along with the exchange of their data and results. However, it is possible to find some issues that speak of the TSA but without exchanging information or results.
>
> Joinup TSA reference:
> https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/belgian-interoperability-catalogue/solution/tunnel-setup-protocol/distribution/rfc3161-internet-x509-public-key-infrastructure-time-stamp-protocol-tsp

Useful links

CAMSS Joinup Page (https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/common-assessment-method-standards-and-specifications-camss)

CAMSS Library of Assessments (https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/common-assessment-method-standards-and-specifications-camss/camss-assessments-library)

CAMSS Assessment EIF Scenario - User Guide (https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/common-assessment-method-standards-and-specifications-camss/solution/camss-assessment-eif-scenario/camss-assessment-eif-scenario-quick-user-guide)

Contact

CAMSS@everis.com

CAMSS Assessment EIF Scenario v6.0.0 - Results

CAMSS Assessment Result

Thank you for your contribution.

The score of the specification related to the scenario under which it is being evaluated depends on the scores achieved in each section of the survey. Please see the example below for guidance.

The following table shows the 'compliance levels' that a specification can reach depending on the assessment score.

EIF Scenario Compliance Level Conversion Table

Section	Ad-hoc	Opportunistic	Compliance Level Essential	Sustainable	Seamless
Principles setting the context for EU Actions on Interoperability	20	40	50	80	90
EIF Core Interoperability Principles	0 to 340	341 to 681	681 to 1020	1021 to 1360	1361 to 1700
EIF Principles Related to generic user needs and expectations	0 to 240	241 to 480	481 to 720	721 to 960	961 to 1200

EIF Foundation principles for cooperation among public administrations	0 to 100	101 to 200	201 to 300	301 to 400	401 to 500
EIF Interoperability Layers	0 to 200	201 to 400	401 to 600	601 to 800	801 to 1000

The table below expresses the range of the score per section. When used in combination with the table above, the total score can be interpreted. See the example below for guidance.

Section Compliance Conversion Table

Compliance Level	Description
Ad-hoc	Poor level of conformance with the EIF - The specification does not cover the requirements and recommendations set out by the EIF in this area.
Opportunistic	Fair level of conformance with the EIF - The specification barely covers the requirements and recommendations set out by the European Interoperability Framework in this area.
Essential	Essential level of conformance with the EIF - The specification covers the basic aspects set out in the requirement and recommendations from the European Interoperability Framework.
Sustainable	Good level of conformance with the EIF scenario - The specification covers all the requirements and recommendations set out by the European Interoperability Framework in this area.
Seamless	Leading practice of conformance level with the EIF - The specification fully covers the requirements and recommendations set out by the European Interoperability Framework in this area.

Example – How to find the final Compliance Level

Using the score reached after the initial assessment, the interpretation can be made as follows.

1. In the summary table, observe the score for each section, e.g. EIF Core Interoperability Principles has 1800 points.

2. In the middle table – the Section Compliance Conversion Table – see that this number correlates to a column. In our example, the 1800 points of Core Interoperability Principles fall in the EIF Core Interoperability Principles row, and '1441 to 1800' point range, placing it in the column 'Compliance **Seamless**'.

3. Next, in the top table – the EIF Scenario Compliance Level Conversion Table – we see Compliance Level "**Seamless**", and from its description that the specification for the EIF Core Interoperability Principles 'fully covers the requirements and recommendations set out by the European Interoperability Framework in this area.'.

For additional calculation of the assessment strength, please follow the instruction provided in the User Guide, found [here](#).

Summary

Your Score   4160

Maximum Score   4500

Section	Score for this Section	
EIF PRINCIPLES SETTING THE CONTEXT FOR EU ACTIONS ON INTEROPERABILITY	20/100	
EIF CORE INTEROPERABILITY PRINCIPLES	1700 /1700	
EIF PRINCIPLES RELATED TO GENERIC USER NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS	1100 /1200	
EIF FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES FOR COOPERATION AMONG PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIONS	500 /500	
EIF INTEROPERABILITY LAYERS	840 /1000	

Scores by Question

EIF PRINCIPLES SETTING THE CONTEXT FOR EU ACTIONS ON INTEROPERABILITY

Score for this Section: 20/100

A1 - To what extent has the specification been included in a national catalogue from a Member State whose National Interoperability Framework has a high performance on interoperability according to National Interoperability Framework Observatory factsheets?

Your answer | ❌ The specification has not been included within the catalogue of any Member State. | 20 out of 100 points

EIF CORE INTEROPERABILITY PRINCIPLES

Score for this Section: 1700/1700

A2 - Does the specification facilitate the publication of data on the web?

Your answer | ✔ Not Applicable | 100 out of 100 points

A3 - To what extent do stakeholders have the opportunity to contribute to the development of the specification?

Your answer | ✔ The working group is open to all without specific fees, registration, or other conditions. | 100 out of 100 points

A4 - To what extent is a public review part of the release lifecycle?

Your answer | ✔ All major and minor releases foresee a public review during which collected feedback is publicly visible. | 100 out of 100 points

A5 - To what extent do restrictions and royalties apply to the specification's use?

Your answer | ✔ Use of the specification is royalty-free and its Intellectual Property Right (IPR) policy or licence is aligned with Fair, Reasonable and Non-Discriminatory (F/RAND) principles. | 100 out of 100 points

A6 - To what extent is the specification sufficiently mature for its use in the development of digital solutions/services?

Your answer   ✔️ The specification, in addition to having major releases available, has published documentation on its supporting processes (e.g. change management and release management).

100 out of 100 points

A7 - To what extent has the specification sufficient market acceptance for its use in the development of digital solutions/services?

Your answer   ✔️ The specification does not have market acceptance because it is directly used to create innovative solutions.

100 out of 100 points

A8 - To what extent has the specification support from at least one community?

Your answer   ✔️ There is a community tasked to provide public support linked to the specification and manage its maintenance.

100 out of 100 points

A9 - To what extent does the specification enable the visibility of administrative procedures, rules data, and services?

Your answer   ✔️ The specification actively promotes and supports visibility.

100 out of 100 points

A10 - To what extent does the specification scope comprehensibly administrative procedures, rules data, and services?

Your answer   ✔️ Not Applicable

100 out of 100 points

A11 - To what extent does the specification enable the exposure of interfaces to access the public administration's services?

Your answer   ✔️ Not Applicable

100 out of 100 points

A12 - To what extent is the specification usable beyond the business-specific domain, allowing its usage across business domains?

| Your answer | ✔ The specification is domain-agnostic, designed to be implemented and/or used in any domain. | 100 out of 100 points | |

A13 - Is the specification technology agnostic?

| Your answer | ✔ YES | 100 out of 100 points | |

A14 - Is the specification platform agnostic?

| Your answer | ✔ YES | 100 out of 100 points | |

A15 - To what extent does the specification allow for partial implementations?

| Your answer | ✔ The specification explicitly foresees sets of requirements that can be implemented incrementally or separately. | 100 out of 100 points | |

A16 - Does the specification allow customisation?

| Your answer | ✔ YES | 100 out of 100 points | |

A17 - Does the specification allow extension?

| Your answer | ✔ YES | 100 out of 100 points | |

A18 - To what extent does the specification enable data portability between systems/applications supporting the implementation or evolution of European public services?

| Your answer | ✔ Not Applicable | 100 out of 100 points | |

EIF PRINCIPLES RELATED TO GENERIC USER NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS

A19 - To what extent does the specification allow relevant information to be reused when needed?

Your answer	✔ Information is provided once-only and reused as needed.	100 out of 100 points	

A20 - To what extent does the specification enable the e-accessibility?

Your answer	✔ Not Applicable	100 out of 100 points	

A21 - To what extent does the specification ensure the protection of personal data managed by Public Administrations?

Your answer	✔ The specification explicitly addresses data protection and its alignment to relevant regulations.	100 out of 100 points	

A22 - Does the specification provide means for restriction of access to information/data?

Your answer	✔ The specification introduces certain aspects that can contribute to enabling confidentiality.	80 out of 100 points	

A23 - Is the specification included in any initiative at European or National level covering privacy aspects?

Your answer	✔ Yes, at European level.	100 out of 100 points	

A24 - To what extent does the specification enable the secure exchange of data?

Your answer	✔ The specification addresses data security and trustworthy data exchange but specific provisions to enable them are limited.	80 out of 100 points	

A25 - To what extent does the specification enable the secure processing of data?

| Your answer | ✔ The specification explicitly addresses and enables the secure and trustworthy processing of data. | 100 out of 100 points |

A26 - To what extent the specification guarantees the authenticity and authentication of the roles agents involved in the data transactions?

| Your answer | ✔ The specification explicitly addresses and enables the implementation of authenticity features. | 100 out of 100 points |

A27 - To what extent information is protected against unauthorised changes?

| Your answer | ✔ The specification addresses data integrity but without specific provisions to enable it. | 60 out of 100 points |

A28 - To what extent does the specification ensure and enable data processing accuracy?

| Your answer | ✔ The specification introduces certain aspects that can contribute to enabling data accuracy. | 80 out of 100 points |

A29 - To what extent does the specification provide an access control mechanism?

| Your answer | ✔ Not Applicable | 100 out of 100 points |

A30 - To what extent could the specification be used in a multilingual context?

| Your answer | ✔ Not Applicable | 100 out of 100 points |

EIF FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES FOR COOPERATION AMONG PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIONS

Score for this Section: 500/500

A31 - Does the specification simplify the delivery of European public services?

Your answer	✔ YES	100 out of 100 points

A32 - Does the specification enable digital service delivery channels?

Your answer	✔ YES	100 out of 100 points

A33 - To what extent does the specification enable the long-term preservation of data/information /knowledge (electronic records included)?

Your answer	✔ The specification explicitly addresses and enables long-term preservation.	100 out of 100 points

A34 - To what extent are there assessments of the specification's effectiveness?

Your answer	✔ There are such assessments directly addressing the specification.	100 out of 100 points

A35 - To what extent are there assessments of the specification's efficiency?

Your answer	✔ There are such assessments directly addressing the specification.	100 out of 100 points

EIF INTEROPERABILITY LAYERS

Score for this Section: 840/1000

A36 - Is the (or could it be) specification mapped to the European Interoperability Architecture (EIRA)?

Your answer	✔ YES	100 out of 100 points

A37 - To what extent can the conformance of the specification's implementations be assessed?

Your answer	✔ The specification is complemented by a conformance testing platform to allow testing of implementations.	100 out of 100 points

A38 - Is the specification recommended by a European Member State?

Your
answer
✔ YES

100
out of
100
points

A39 - Is the specification selected for its use in a European Cross-border project/initiative?

Your
answer
✔ YES

100
out of
100
points

A40 - Is the specification included in an open repository/catalogue of standards at national level?

Your
answer
✖ NO

20
out of
100
points

A41 - Is the specification included in an open repository/catalogue of standards at European level?

Your
answer
✔ YES

100
out of
100
points

A42 - Is the specification a European Standard?

Your
answer
✖ NO

20
out of
100
points

A43 - Does the specification facilitate the modelling of business processes?

Your
answer
✔ Not Applicable

100
out of
100
points

A44 - To what extent does the specification facilitate organisational interoperability agreements?

Your
answer
✔ Not Applicable

100
out of
100
points

A45 - Does the specification encourage the creation of communities along with the sharing of their data and results in national and/or European platforms?

Your answer	✔ Not Applicable	100 out of 100 points	

Contact	CAMSS@everis.com
Useful links	CAMSS Joinup Page
	CAMSS Library of Assessments
	CAMSS Assessment EIF Scenario - User Guide
Contribution ID	8242b480-e05d-40a8-a07b-466c62e5bf22
Completed at	15/05/2024 11:39:45
Completion time	-