

# Information Model discussion

Laurence Lundblade  
September 10, 2019

# Four Information Model Concepts

1. One description for several serialization formats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Only one description / notation is used to describe each information element (e.g. claim). CDDL is the primary candidate notation.</li><li>• Multiple serialization formats are mechanically derived. JSON and CBOR are the primary candidates.</li><li>• Aligns with Info and Data Models (RFC 3444) and Terminology for Policy-Based Management (RFC 3198)</li><li>• Concept used in draft-ietf-rats-eat-01</li></ul>
2. One model for ALL of RATs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A single common information RFC is created and normatively referenced by all other RATs RFCs<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Used by architecture document</li><li>• Covers all claims/assertion definitions (e.g. EAT)</li><li>• Covers conveyance protocols (TUDA, YANG module)</li></ul></li><li>• Concept used in draft-birkholz-rats-information-model-00</li></ul>
3. More sophisticated structure for claims/assertions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More nesting, sub categories and structure of claims is needed to express complex entity / device architectures</li><li>• This concept is manifest in the <code>submods</code> and <code>nested_eat</code> claims in draft-ietf-rats-eat-01</li></ul>
4. Typing and abstraction for claims/assertions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some data types should be defined that can be common to the definition of several claims</li><li>• This is concept is manifest in the <code>StringOrURI</code> and <code>NumericDate</code> data type shared several claims in JWT (RFC7519), CWT (RFC 8392) and draft-ietf-rats-eat-01</li></ul>

# Laurence's Preferences

1. One description for several serialization formats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Essential</li><li>• We clearly need more than one serialization format (CBOR and JSON); replicating a claim definition for each serialization format will be wasteful and error prone</li><li>• CDDL is a practical solution that can work</li></ul>
2. One model for ALL of RATs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Impractical because the span is too large</li><li>• There will be several RATs documents authored by different people, that will evolve at different rates and exist for different purposes</li><li>• Hard to update the common info model RFC every time a new claim is added or the architecture shifts or something is added to a conveyance protocol</li></ul>
3. More sophisticated structure for claims/assertions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yes, let's work on this (but this doesn't seem necessarily bound to the info model concept)</li></ul>
4. Typing and abstraction for claims/assertions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yes, let's work on this (but this doesn't seem necessarily bound to the info model concept)</li></ul>