

suit claims in rats

ietf 113

Brendan Moran

2022-03-24

Recap

- Previous drafts of SUIR claims in RATS defined SUIR-specific elements that require attestation
- SUIR Report can also carry these elements
- Proposed at RATS interim that draft-ietf-suir-rats-claims could be merged with draft-ietf-suir-report
 - Rejected: some of the claims in draft-ietf-suir-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

- SUI reports are evidence
- SUI reports are NOT results
- A verifier SHOULD translate a SUI report into generic EAT claims

Proposal

- A SUI 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