

## IETF Interim Meeting

June 5, 2025

### In Attendance:

- Sean Turner, Erica Olsen (co-chairs)
- Corbin Streett, Apple
- Maggie Delano
- Brent Ledvina
- Behcet Sarikaya
- Christine Fossaceca
- Cullen Jennings
- David Millman
- Deb Cooley
- Drew Cooley
- Michael Richardson
- Shailesh Prabhu
- Siddika Polatkan
- Tero Kivinen

### Meeting Notes:

- Currently have 3 docs, will have 4.
- Charter says goal is to wrap this process up this summer, but we can change/update those as needed.
- Group agreement in meeting virtually more and not having a session in-person at next IETF meeting.

### Doc 1: Threat Model

- Summary: identifying applicable attacks and rethinking taxonomy (scenarios for unwanted tracking).
  - o Attacks – almost done
  - o Taxonomy – Jessie will be working on this
- Issues:
  - o Pull-request on terminology
    - Tried to organize definitions that are crossing docs. Certain docs will need to have some additional definitions, but content needs to be consistent.
      - <https://github.com/ietf-wg-dult/threat-model/pull/102/files>
    - Option to define everything in the TM doc and then refer back when repeating. Better to have definitions in one place and not repeated.
      - Maggie will make a draft pr
  - o Remote disablement

- Can query through your phone to find owner info. People may not be able to find the actual device, but will still want to disable it. Don't have a good answer to this yet.
- Siddika has some scenarios for this.
  - Problem: Repeat alerts, but tracker is well-hidden, maybe speaker removed. Cannot disable w/o finding physical device.
  - Question: Should the Accessory Protocol include instructions for remote disablement?
  - Scenarios:
    - 1 – victim cannot find tracker being misused to track them
    - 2 – user leaves bag in uber, driver gets notification and disables it, meaning user cannot locate their bag. Removes the primary purpose of tracker.
    - 3 – stolen bike, thief gets alert and disables it. Thief could also manually scan and disable. Remote disablement could defeat the purpose.
  - Disablement Conditions:
    - Allowed only for tags in Bluetooth range
    - Allowed for tags in separated mode
    - Permanent vs. temporary? If temporary, how long?
    - Thoughts on the trade-off between the protections for scenario 1 vs. the annoyance brought about in scenario 2 and 3.
  - Recommendations:
    - Try to reduce accidental disablement. After trying to find device.
  - Discussion:
    - Prefer to make trade-offs to prioritize protecting people over property. Will have to think about the risks and weigh it all.
    - We need to support the ability to do things, but companies will decide on timing and details (ie, after 5 mins, etc).
    - Disablement is in the accessory protocol already, just currently needs physical access. What about the anxiety that would come with a temporary state?
    - Importance of reducing false alerts as a part of increasing accuracy and limiting scenarios.
    - Should remote disablement be equivalent or have a higher bar, different timeframe, etc?
    - Not sure that the criteria will actually be enforceable, though. An attacker may be non-compliant.
      - Manufacturer requirements vs. platform policies?

- Implication of the attacker misusing unless you can authenticate
- The only thing the tag observes is whether it's shut off or not. How would you determine if they have looked for the device, for example?
  - Siddika will follow up with Eric as his feedback was hard to hear / getting cut off.

#### Finding Tracking Tags:

- Expired. Need to do a new release/new version. Eric will help Christina will that so it stays updated.
- German colleague of Christina found a device that is able to be registered and didn't have any tracking alerts and wasn't being detected by AirGuard. Tried to recommend in the doc to not allow devices that are not compliant. Better end-point verification? Devices shouldn't be able to leverage the finding protocol.
- Best option is to suggest something for this, put in what you want and see if there are objections. People need something to review.
- This and the TM doc can be done in parallel. Maggie suggested that there may be content in the TM that is relevant to this – design requirements and constraints.
- Would be helpful to get some of the authors of the Multi-Dealer Secret Sharing

#### Next Meeting:

- Needs to be before July 7 and after start of Aug
- Monthly + will cancel if we need to