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Background: Reference Architecture

- Relevant terminology
  - Attestation Result: The evaluation results generated by a Verifier, typically including information about an Attester, where the Verifier vouches for the validity of the results.
  - Attester: An entity whose attributes must be evaluated in order to determine whether the entity is considered trustworthy, such as when deciding whether the entity is authorized to perform some operation.
  - Endorsement: A secure statement that some entity (typically a manufacturer) vouches for the integrity of an Attester's signing capability.
  - Endorser: An entity that creates Endorsements that can be used to help evaluate trustworthiness of Attesters.
  - Evidence: A set of information about an Attester that is to be evaluated by a Verifier.
Ref. Arch. (cont.)

• Sec. 8.3 (“Attestation Results”) states
  – “Finally, whereas Evidence is signed by the device (or indirectly by a manufacturer, if Endorsements are used), Attestation Results are signed by a Verifier, allowing a Relying Party to only need a trust relationship with one entity, rather than a larger set of entities, for purposes of its Appraisal Policy.”

• Lack of endorsements can also be considered in execution of appraisal policy – how can this be addressed in RAts specifications?
Ref. Arch. – Trusted Paths

• Passport model

Assume Mutually-authenticated transport Path
• Endorsement may not be required
• Depends on appraisal policy
Trusted Paths (cont.)

- Background Check
Does CWT Allow for Unendorsed Tokens?

- RFC 8392 seems to allow it
  - “Depending upon whether the CWT is signed, MACed, or encrypted…”
- RFC 8392 also states
  - “If present, the CWT tag MUST prefix a tagged object using one of the COSE CBOR tags.”
- RFC 8152 (COSE spec) defines two constructs: the COSE object and COSE message type
  - COSE object includes protected headers, unprotected headers, message content
  - Valid message types are: -sign, -sign1, -encrypt, -encrypt0, -mac, -mac0
    - Not clear what RFC 8152’s recommendation is for unendorsed messages
Why Send and Unendorsed Token?  
...even if the path is trusted

• Some resource-limited devices may want to avoid exercising their crypto engines when not absolutely required by appraisal policy
  – e.g. for power reasons

• Some transport paths may be trusted and throughput-limited
  – LTE Narrowband IoT for instance (~10’s of kbps)
  – Crypto overhead can be costly
Why Solve this in rats?

• Would like an interoperable solution for unendorsed tokens
• Leverage existing standardized formats
  – EAT/CWT/COSE
• Avoid custom protocols based on attestation payload
  – e.g. sending EAT payload as CBOR object
    • How is it distinguished from other CBOR objects sent as part of a communications session betw. RP/Verifier and device?
Ways Forward

• Some options (not all are mutually exclusive)
  – Extend arch. spec. to address unendorsed tokens
  – Define new COSE msg. type
  – Define CBOR tag for attestation payload
  – Extend COSE algm. registry with mode that can be leveraged for unendorsed tokens
    • e.g. zero-length MAC/Hash

• Recommended solution
  – Work with COSE WG to determine best way forward for unendorsed COSE message
  – Architecture team defines recommended practices for unendorsed COSE tokens