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Recap

- Previous drafts of SUIT claims in RATS defined SUIT-specific elements that require attestation
- SUIT Report can also carry these elements
- Proposed at RATS interim that draft-ietf-suit-rats-claims could be merged with draft-ietf-suit-report
  - Rejected: some of the claims in draft-ietf-suit-rats-claims are duplicated by elements added in RATS
  - This does not seem like the correct decision to the authors.
  - We want to revisit the discussion with some additional explanation for the reasoning.
Semantics vs. Structure

• EAT contains data with specific semantics and structure
• SUIT report contains data with similar semantics and different structure.
• SUIT report structure is intended to reduce overhead on constrained devices
  • Tightly coupled to SUIT parsing
  • On-the-fly encoding to reduce intermediate storage
  • Generated in order-of-use (from manifest)
  • Consistent with non-attestation reporting for SUIT.
    • => Does not seem like premature optimization
• SUIT report evidence vs generic EAT claims
  • Similar semantics
  • Different structure, but for a reason
Claim translation

• SUIT reports are evidence
• SUIT reports are NOT results
• A verifier SHOULD translate a SUIT report into generic EAT claims
Proposal

- A SUIT report could occupy a single claim in EAT.
- This is consistent with using it as evidence.
- The verifier can do claim translation where appropriate.
- This moves format translation overhead:
  - From constrained end-nodes
  - To unconstrained verifiers
- This merges draft-ietf-suit-rats-claims and draft-ietf-suit-report, and adds a single EAT claim to draft-ietf-suit-report.