Use cases for RATS WG
for October 8, 2019 – Virtual Interim
draft-richardson-rats-usecases-05

DIFF:

https://www.ietf.org/rfcdiff?url2=draft-richardson-rats-usecases-05

Authors:

Michael Richardson (Sandelman)

mcr+ietf@sandelman.ca

Carl Wallace (Red Hound Software)

Wei Pan (Huawei Technologies)

Where are we

- side meeting morning of 2019-07-25
  - much difficulty turning the discussion into concrete changes to the document.
    - seems like more heat than light in discussion
    - still struggling with impact to use case document
  - would like to consider a "do-over"
- have included TEEP use case
- have anticipated Architecture Document will add
  - passport category
  - background-check category

Template for use cases

- Each Use case now includes template
  - Use case name: Twelve Monkeys
  - Who will use it: Army of the Twelve Monkeys SDO
  - Attesting Party: James Cole
  - Relying Party: Dr. Kathryn Reilly
  - Attestation Type: {passport, background-check}
  - Description: James Cole must convince Dr. Reilly he is from the future, and not insane.
  - Claims used:
    - OEM Identity
    - Age Claim
    - Location Claim
    - Uptime Claim

Observations so far:
Attestation Type (passport/background-check)

- 5.1. Device Capabilities/Firmware Attestation (4 subcases passport, 2 subcases, background)
- 5.2. Hardware resiliency / watchdogs
- 5.3. IETF TEEP WG use case
- 5.4. *Confidential Machine Learning (ML) model*
- 5.5. *Critical infrastructure (one subcase)*
- 5.6. *Virtualized multi-tenant hosts*
- 5.7. *Cryptographic Key Attestation (3 subcases)*
- 5.8. Geographic attestation
- 5.9. *Connectivity attestation*
- 5.10. Component connectivity attestation
- 5.11. Device provenance attestation
- 5.12. DNS privacy policy (new)

- 4 are background check
- 7 are passport
- *8 are TBD*
    - *might be hard to define without more details*
- **observed that some supposed "duplicates" differ in type!**

Suggested Next steps

1) Detail passport/background situation in... Architecture Draft?!?

  - convince ourselves that there isn't a third case

2) Argue over passport/background check for each case.

I. start considering what might be standard claims, start putting them somewhere.

II. Argue which use cases invoke which claims, and whether the uses of the claims are sufficiently compatible that they are the same claim.