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Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:
By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.

If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.

As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.

Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.

As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:
• BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
• BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
• BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
• BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
• BCP 78 (Copyright)
• BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
• https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/ (Privacy Policy)
Administrative Tasks

• Blue sheets
• Jabber scribes
• Note takers
Agenda

1) Introduction, Logistics and Agenda Bash (chairs) (5 min)

2) Problem Statement (Henk Birkholz and Ned Smith) (20 min)

3) Relevant Work
   3.1) Compromise Trustworthy Visibility in Working Systems (Eric Voit) (5 min)
   3.2) Oauth and IoT (Hannes Tschofenig) (5 min)

4) Problem Statement Discussion (open mic) (30 min)

5) An Attestation Format (Laurence Lundblade) (15 min)
   -- draft: draft-mandyam-eat-00

6) Next Steps (30 min)
   -- Discussion (open mic) (10 min)
   -- Consensus Call for Scoping Questions (10+ min)
   -- More discussion or charter discussion (as time allows)

7) Chair Wrap-Up (chairs) (5 min)
Introduction

Relying parties require evidence about the trustworthiness of remote system components [RFC4949] they interact with. Remote attestation procedures (RATS) enable relying parties to establish a level of confidence in the trustworthiness of remote system components by creating and processing attestation evidence. Based on the provided evidence, a relying party can decide whether to consider a remote system component trustworthy or not.

-- Draft Charter
https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/103/materials/slides-103-rats-draft-charter-00
Starting Points for the Program of Work?

1. Specify a terminology, architecture and use cases
   – draft-birkholz-rats-architecture-00

2. Specify an information model for assertions/claims which provide information about system components characteristics
   – draft-mandyam-eat-00

3. Specify data models that implements and secures the defined information model
   – draft-mandyam-eat-00

4. Specify interoperable protocols to securely convey assertions/claims

5. Specify interoperable protocols to appraise attestation evidence via reference values
Scoping Questions

• Is the problem sufficiently understood?
• Is this problem tractable?
• Is this the right place to address the problem?
• Who is willing to author drafts?
• Who is willing to review drafts?
• How should this work be done in the IETF?
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