draft-ietf-cdni-uri-signing

What's new since IETF 99 (Prague)

Changes from 12 to 13

- Add registry for cdnistt
 - DASH-IF spec support
- Add back text about key usage
 - Symmetric vs Asymmetric
 - Key Distribution out of scope
- Make HAS support more generic and not call it "token chaining"
- Various nits

- We have an implementation!
- We have a few issues that have been brought up on the list from the implementer.

GitHub Issues

- #28 Replace the aud claim with a cdniip claim
- #29 Make cdniets mandatory when using the Signed Token Chain
- #30 Changed sub claim to cdniuc and introduced new sub claim
- #31 Clarify the definition of "parameter"
- #32 Fix chicken-and-egg problem with URI Containers
- #33 Limit globs in URI Container

#28 Replace the aud claim with a cdniip claim

aud claim

Each principal intended to process the JWT MUST identify itself with a value in the audience claim. If the principal processing the claim does not identify itself with a value in the "aud" claim when this claim is present, then the JWT MUST be rejected.

#29 Make cdniets mandatory when using the Signed Token Chain

This seems fairly straight forward, would just like to consider the wording a little more closely on this one.

#30 Changed sub claim to cdniuc and introduced new sub claim

StringOrURI

A JSON string value, with the additional requirement that while arbitrary string values MAY be used, any value containing a ":" character MUST be a URI [RFC3986]. StringOrURI values are compared as case-sensitive strings with no transformations or canonicalizations applied.

#31 Clarify the definition of "parameter"

There is no real definition of "query parameter" or "path parameter" as they are merely common practice. This more clearly defines them.

#32 Fix chicken-and-egg problem with URI Containers

Clarify that the URISigningPackage needs to be removed before matching the URI and provide a systematic way to do it.

#33 Limit globs in URI Container

The glob URI container is overly greedy and that can be used to match URIs that were not intended. This makes it a bit more strict.

Do we still want to keep this container?

Comments?