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What it is - Describes PoP Architecture

... and motivates the development of such.

Abstract

The OAuth 2.0 bearer token specification, as defined in RFC 6750, allows any party in possession of a bearer token (a "bearer") to get access to the associated resources (without demonstrating possession of a cryptographic key). To prevent misuse, bearer tokens must be protected from disclosure in transit and at rest.

Some scenarios demand additional security protection whereby a client needs to demonstrate possession of cryptographic keying material when accessing a protected resource. This document motivates the development of the OAuth 2.0 proof-of-possession security mechanism.
The work started in July 2014
That’s 9 years ago and I was assuming the work has completed and …

I pointed out an author of an academic paper I was reviewing that they may want to refer to the RFC for the categorization of non-bearer tokens.

Then, the answer “I cannot find it” came back.

To my surprise,
The draft has expired and marked “dead” despite it was “Almost ready”.
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I still believe that this draft has useful information.
Do we have an appetite to have it cross the goal line so that it can be referenced?

If so, what’s the next step?