EAT: Open issues
Recommendations for Last Call Resolution

Note: focus on issue not marked "Ready to Close"

Issue 4: Should there be both "restricted" and "secure Restricted" security levels

- Not clear how RP's would use EAT security level
- Current recommendation: remove FIDO language (https://github.com/ietf-rats-wg/eat/pull/116)
- Suggestion: incorporate PR and close issue before Last Call (LC)

Issue 10: Add guidance on registration of claims corresponding to YANG objects
Issue 64: looking for example of EAT with PCR quote

- Appears to be tied into whether TPM attestation should be cast to EAT
- Unclear about use case
  - TPM's can already provide their own attestation
- Both issues do not appear to be LC blocking – recommend closing without resolving

Issue 15: should/must consistency
Issue 17: SHOULD or MUST re: cryptographic verifiability
Issue 100: Use normative language in profile expectations?

- All normative language must be review before LC completion
- Recommend to keep open through group LC and close only afterwards

Issue 27: Remove Sec. 1.3 EAT Operating Models
Issue 119: Some rework to use RATS architecture draft terminology

- Recommendation stands RATS architecture document should be reference for operating model
- LC blocking
- Recommended next steps: create PR with replacement text referring to RATS arch. doc.

Issue 40: Add examples of submod and nested EAT tokens

- Resolved with https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-rats-eat#appendix-A.2
- Recommend keeping open through group LC and closing if no new example suggestions forthcoming

Issue 58: Who assigns the security level of a submodule

- Recommendation: do not address in EAT
  - Address in RATS architecture doc.
- Not LC blocking

Issue 110: Add a recommendation that claim value should not be interdependent

- Claim interdependency: is it allowed?
- Recommend not addressing in EAT spec to preserve flexibility
- Not LC blocking

Issue 111: svn claim

- Security version number: currently used and meaningful to RP's
- Recommend addressing prior to LC

Issue 117: Submodule type that is a hash of the detached submodule token

- Claim could be used for measured boot
- Recommend resolving prior to LC with candidate PR

Issue 118: Review Android Attestation for possible claims

- Unclear what would appear in an Android attestation based on EAT
  - Resemble keystore?
  - Resemble SafetyNet?
  - Other?
- Recommend not addressing prior to LC – leave for Android EAT profile