

JOSE Open Issues on Existing Features and Document Structuring Issues

Mike Jones

Microsoft Identity Standards Architect

March 27, 2012

Clarify t_{yp} Header Parameter

- Clarify the intended use of the t_{yp} Header Parameter across the JWS, JWE, and JWT specifications
 - Recommendation: State intended use to convey data type information about payload/plaintext
- Decide whether a registry of t_{yp} values is appropriate
 - Recommendation: Create Registry

Clarify Key ID (`kid`) Semantics

- What happens if a `kid` header is received with an unrecognized value? Is that an error? Should it be treated as if it's empty?
 - Recommendation: Treat as error

Combine the JWS and JWE alg parameter registries?

- Combine the JWS and JWE alg parameter registries?
 - Recommendation: Yes – in JWA spec
- Combine the header parameter registries?
 - Recommendation: No – Other than alg, these parameters are mostly quite different

Should the JWE Encrypted Key be moved to the header?

- Should the JWE Encrypted Key be moved to the header or left in a separate period-separated part to prevent double base64 encoding?
- JWE would have 3 parts like JWS, instead of 4
- Doing this would add about 20 bytes to every JWE
 - Recommendation: Leave as-is

Should JWK alg family definitions "EC" and "RSA" be moved to JWA?

- Would result in all the family-specific parameter definitions also moving there ("crv", "x", "y", "mod", "exp"), leaving almost no normative text in the JWK spec
- Seems like it would significantly reduce spec readability and so was not done
 - Recommendation: Leave as-is

Consider how additional key families would be added to JWK

- At present, would happen by revising spec
- Alternatively, new key families could be added to JWA
 - Recommendation: No change needed – either method is acceptable