

GNAP Meeting

IETF 116

draft-ietf-gnap-core-protocol-13
draft-ietf-gnap-resource-servers-03

March 31, 2023

Justin Richer • Fabien Imbault

Agenda

- Core draft update: changes since IETF115 (from -11 to -13)
- RS draft update: changes since IETF114 (from -02 to -03)
- GNAP Status

Differences since IETF115

[https://author-tools.ietf.org/iddiff
?url2=draft-ietf-gnap-core-protocol-13
&url1=draft-ietf-gnap-core-protocol-11](https://author-tools.ietf.org/iddiff?url2=draft-ietf-gnap-core-protocol-13&url1=draft-ietf-gnap-core-protocol-11)

[https://author-tools.ietf.org/iddiff
?url2=draft-ietf-gnap-resource-servers-03](https://author-tools.ietf.org/iddiff?url2=draft-ietf-gnap-resource-servers-03)

Core Draft Changes

- Shift to SHA256 default
- IANA Registry Actions
- Remove “previous_key” from key rotation
- Clarify differences between “new” token and “rotated” token value
- Respond to WGLC comments (mostly editorial, clarification, or consistency)

RS Draft Changes

- Token model
- IANA registry actions

Token Model

- Value
- Issuer
- Audience
- Key Binding
- Flags
- Access Rights
- Time Validity Window
- Authorizing Resource Owner
- Client Instance
- Label
- Parent Grant Request

Current Open Issues on Core

- Token management endpoint access
- Multiple interaction finish methods

Token management endpoint

- Current setup:
 - Present the token being managed as usual
 - ALWAYS sign with the client instance's key
- Problems with this:
 - Token could be expired (for either rotation or revocation)
 - Prevents use of middleware to check token access here
- Proposed alternative:
 - Pass token value as body parameter (as in introspection)
 - Optional secondary token to protect token management endpoint?
- **Editors opinion: possibly worth the change**
 - Not a lot of deployment experience with token management, might be the time to change it

Multiple finish methods

- Current setup:
 - Client sends only one finish method
 - AS responds to one (or zero)
- Problems with this:
 - Client might not be able to guess which methods are OK ahead of time
 - Not quite in the spirit of “negotiation” elsewhere
- Proposed alternative:
 - Allow client to send multiple finish methods
 - AS still responds to only one (or zero)
- **Editors opinion: defer to an extension**
 - An extension can be defined to handle this behavior without breaking existing code
 - Tagged as “Need Text”

GNAP Status

- WGLC finished on Core
 - We should decide whether to change anything for token rotation
- Ready (soon) for IETF LC