

COSE
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: 27 August 2026

E. Lundberg, Ed.
Yubico
M. B. Jones
Self-Issued Consulting
23 February 2026

Split signing algorithms for COSE
draft-lundberg-cose-two-party-signing-algs-05

Abstract

This specification defines COSE algorithm identifiers for negotiating how to split a signature algorithm between two cooperating parties. Typically the first party hashes the data to be signed and the second party finishes the signature over the hashed data. This is a common technique, useful for example when the signing private key is held in a smart card or similar hardware component with limited processing power and communication bandwidth. The resulting signatures are identical in structure to those computed by a single party, and can be verified using the same verification algorithm without additional steps to preprocess the signed data.

About This Document

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

Status information for this document may be found at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-lundberg-cose-two-party-signing-algs/>.

Discussion of this document takes place on the COSE Working Group mailing list (<mailto:cose@ietf.org>), which is archived at <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/browse/cose/>. Subscribe at <https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/cose/>.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at <https://github.com/YubicoLabs/cose-two-party-signing-algs-rfc>.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 27 August 2026.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2026 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1. Requirements Notation and Conventions | 4 |
| 2. Split Signing Algorithms | 4 |
| 2.1. ECDSA | 5 |
| 2.2. HashEdDSA | 6 |
| 2.3. Defining Split Signing Algorithms | 7 |
| 3. COSE Signing Arguments | 8 |
| 3.1. COSE Signing Arguments Common Parameters | 9 |
| 4. Security Considerations | 9 |
| 4.1. Protocol-Level Trusted Roles | 10 |
| 4.2. Component-Level Trusted Roles | 10 |
| 4.3. Incorrect Use of Split Signing Algorithm Identifiers | 11 |
| 5. Implementation Considerations | 11 |
| 5.1. Using Non-Split Signing Algorithm Identifiers in a Split Signing Protocol | 12 |
| 6. IANA Considerations | 12 |
| 6.1. COSE Algorithms Registrations | 12 |
| 6.2. COSE Signing Arguments Common Parameters Registry | 14 |
| 6.3. COSE Signing Arguments Algorithm Parameters Registry | 14 |
| 7. Implementation Status | 14 |
| 7.1. Dependent Specifications | 16 |
| 8. References | 16 |
| 8.1. Normative References | 16 |
| 8.2. Informative References | 17 |
| Acknowledgements | 19 |

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| Document History | 19 |
| Authors' Addresses | 21 |

1. Introduction

CBOR Object Signing and Encryption (COSE) [RFC9052] algorithm identifiers are used for algorithm negotiation and to annotate cryptographic objects with how to interpret them, for example which algorithm to use to verify a signature or decapsulate a shared key. Existing COSE algorithm identifiers omit some internal details of how the object was constructed, since those details are typically irrelevant for the recipient.

The algorithm identifiers defined in this specification are meant for a complementary use case: to divide responsibilities during construction of a cryptographic object, instead of describing how to consume the object. Specifically, they provide an interoperable way to negotiate how a signing operation is split between two cooperating parties, for example, a smart card and a software application, while the verification algorithm for the resulting signature remains the same as if the signature was created by a single party. These split algorithm identifiers are therefore not meant for annotating signature objects, since the verification algorithm is better indicated using already existing algorithm identifiers.

As mentioned above, a primary use case for this is for algorithm negotiation between a software application and a smart card or other hardware security module (HSM) holding the signing private key. Since the HSM may have limited processing power and communication bandwidth, it may not be practical to send the entire original message to the HSM. Instead, since most signature algorithms begin with digesting the message into a fixed-length intermediate input, this initial digest can be computed by the software application while the HSM performs the rest of the signature algorithm on the digest. This is a common technique used in standards such as OpenPGP [OPENPGPCARD], PKCS #11 [PKCS11-Spec-v3.1], and PIV [FIPS-201].

Since different signature algorithms digest the message in different ways and at different stages of the algorithm, it is not possible for a cryptographic API to specify that, for example, "the hash digest is computed by the caller" generically for all algorithms. Security considerations for this split may also differ between algorithms. Instead, the algorithm identifiers defined in this specification enable the parties of that cryptographic API to signal precisely, for each signature algorithm individually, which steps of the algorithm are performed by which party. We thus define two roles: the `_digerster_` (e.g., a software application) that initializes the signing procedure, and the `_signer_` (e.g., an HSM) that holds exclusive control of the signing private key.

Note that these algorithm identifiers do not define new "pre-hashed" variants of the base signature algorithm, nor an intermediate "hash envelope" data structure, such as that defined in [I-D.COSE-Hash-Envelope]. Rather, these identifiers denote existing signature algorithms that would typically be executed by a single party, but split into two stages.

Some signature algorithms, such as PureEdDSA [RFC8032], by their design, cannot be split in this way, and therefore cannot be assigned split signing algorithm identifiers. However, if such a signature algorithm defines a "pre-hashed" variant, that "pre-hashed" algorithm can be assigned a split signing algorithm identifier, enabling the pre-hashing step to be performed by the `_digerster_` and the remaining steps by the `_signer_`. For example, this specification defines Ed25519ph-split (Section 2.2) as a split variant of Ed25519ph [RFC8032]. Note that Ed25519 and Ed25519ph have distinct verification algorithms, but Ed25519ph and Ed25519ph-split use the same verification algorithm.

1.1. Requirements Notation and Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 RFC2119 [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

2. Split Signing Algorithms

This section defines divisions of signing algorithm steps between a `_digerster_` and a `_signer_` in a split signing protocol, and assigns algorithm identifiers to these algorithm divisions. The `_digerster_` performs the first part of the split algorithm and does not have access to the signing private key, while the `_signer_` performs the second part of the split algorithm and has access to the signing

private key. For signing algorithms that format the message to insert domain separation tags, as described in Section 2.2.5 of [RFC9380], this message formatting is also performed by the `_signer_`.

How the digest, and any related `COSE_Sign_Args` structure (see Section 3), are transported from `_digerster_` to `_signer_` is out of scope for this specification, but it is expected that the digest will usually be transmitted as the "data to be signed" argument.

The algorithm identifiers defined in this specification with "-split" in their names MAY appear in COSE structures used internally between the `_digerster_` and the `_signer_` in a split signing protocol, but SHOULD NOT appear in COSE structures consumed by signature verifiers. COSE structures consumed by signature verifiers SHOULD instead use the corresponding conventional algorithm identifiers for the verification algorithm. These are listed in the "Verification algorithm" column in the tables defining split signing algorithm identifiers.

The following subsections define an initial set of split signing algorithm identifiers. The last subsection provides guidance for defining additional identifiers beyond this initial set.

2.1. ECDSA

ECDSA [FIPS-186-5] split signing uses the following division between the `_digerster_` and the `_signer_` of the steps of the ECDSA signature generation algorithm [FIPS-186-5]:

- * The signing procedure is defined in Section 6.4.1 of [FIPS-186-5].
- * The `_digerster_` performs Step 1 of the signing procedure - hashing the message, producing the value `_H_`.
- * The message input to the `_signer_` is the value `_H_` defined in the signing procedure.
- * The `_signer_` resumes the signing procedure from Step 2.

The following algorithm identifiers are defined:

| Name | COSE Value | Verification algorithm | Description |
|--------------|------------|------------------------|--|
| ESP256-split | TBD | ESP256 | ESP256 split signing as defined in Section 2.1 |
| ESP384-split | TBD | ESP384 | ESP384 split signing as defined in Section 2.1 |
| ESP512-split | TBD | ESP512 | ESP512 split signing as defined in Section 2.1 |

Table 1: ECDSA split signing algorithm values.

Note: This is distinct from the similarly named Split-ECDSA (SECDSA) [SECDSA], although SECDSA can be implemented using this split procedure as a component.

2.2. HashEdDSA

Split HashEdDSA [RFC8032] uses the following division between the `_digerster_` and the `_signer_` of the steps of the HashEdDSA signing algorithm [RFC8032]:

- * HashEdDSA is a combination of the EdDSA signing procedure and the PureEdDSA signing procedure. The EdDSA signing procedure is defined in the first paragraph of Section 3.3 of [RFC8032]. The PureEdDSA signing procedure is defined in the second paragraph of Section 3.3 of [RFC8032].
- * The `_digerster_` computes the value PH(M) defined in the EdDSA signing procedure.
- * The message input to the `_signer_` is the value PH(M) defined in the EdDSA signing procedure. This value is represented as M in the PureEdDSA signing procedure.
- * The `_signer_` executes the PureEdDSA signing procedure, where the value denoted M in the PureEdDSA signing procedure takes the value denoted PH(M) in the EdDSA signing procedure.

PureEdDSA [RFC8032] cannot be divided in this way since such a division would require that the `_digerster_` has access to the private key.

The following algorithm identifiers are defined:

| Name | COSE Value | Verification algorithm | Description |
|-----------------|------------|------------------------|---|
| Ed25519ph | TBD | Ed25519ph | EdDSA using the Ed25519ph parameter set in Section 5.1 of [RFC8032] |
| Ed25519ph-split | TBD | Ed25519ph | EdDSA using the Ed25519ph parameter set in Section 5.1 of [RFC8032] and split as defined in Section 2.2 |
| Ed448ph | TBD | Ed448ph | EdDSA using the Ed448ph parameter set in Section 5.2 of [RFC8032] |
| Ed448ph-split | TBD | Ed448ph | EdDSA using the Ed448ph parameter set in Section 5.2 of [RFC8032] and split as defined in Section 2.2 |

Table 2: HashEdDSA algorithm values.

2.3. Defining Split Signing Algorithms

Future definitions of additional split signing algorithm identifiers SHOULD follow the conventions established in Section 2 as far as possible. For example, if a signature algorithm prescribes insertion of domain separation tags in a way that requires processing the entirety of the data to be signed, it might be necessary to delegate the domain separation responsibility to the `_digerster_`. Per the considerations in Section 4.2, split signing algorithm identifiers SHOULD be defined in ways that minimize how much responsibility is delegated to the `_digerster_`.

As a concrete example, consider ML-DSA and HashML-DSA [FIPS-204]. ML-DSA and HashML-DSA prefix the input data with a 0 octet and a 1 octet respectively, which enforces domain separation between ML-DSA and HashML-DSA signatures. Appendix D of [RFC9881] describes a mode of ML-DSA that could be assigned a split signing algorithm identifier where the `_digerster_` performs Compute亮 and the `_signer_` performs Sign亮. Note that this puts the `_digerster_` in control of the domain

separation tags; this is necessary if the hash step is not performed by the `_signer_`. Therefore with this construction, it is the `_digerster_` that decides whether the signing protocol will produce an ML-DSA signature or a HashML-DSA signature. In contrast, HashML-DSA first hashes the input data alone and then another time with domain separation tags; therefore HashML-DSA can be assigned a split signing algorithm identifier that keeps the `_signer_` in control of the domain separation tags and ensures that the signing protocol can only produce HashML-DSA signatures.

3. COSE Signing Arguments

While many signature algorithms take the private key and data to be signed as the only two parameters, some signature algorithms have additional parameters that must also be set. For example, to sign using a key derived by ARKG [I-D.bradleylundberg-ARKG], two additional arguments `kh` and `ctx` are needed in ARKG-Derive-Private-Key to derive the signing private key.

While such additional arguments are simple to provide to the API of the signing procedure in a single-party context, in a split signing context these additional arguments also need to be conveyed from the `_digerster_` to the `_signer_`. For this purpose, we define a new COSE structure `COSE_Sign_Args` for "COSE signing arguments". This enables defining a unified, algorithm-agnostic protocol between the `_digerster_` and the `_signer_`, rather than requiring a distinct protocol for each signature algorithm for the sake of conveying algorithm-specific parameters.

`COSE_Sign_Args` is built on a CBOR map. The set of common parameters that can appear in a `COSE_Sign_Args` can be found in the IANA "COSE Signing Arguments Common Parameters" registry (TODO). Additional parameters defined for specific signing algorithms can be found in the IANA "COSE Signing Arguments Algorithm Parameters" registry (TODO).

The CDDL grammar describing `COSE_Sign_Args`, using the CDDL fragment defined in Section 1.5 of [RFC9052], is:

```
COSE_Sign_Args = {  
    3 ^ => tstr / int,    ; alg  
    * label => values,  
}
```

3.1. COSE Signing Arguments Common Parameters

This document defines a set of common parameters for a COSE Signing Arguments object. Table 3 provides a summary of the parameters defined in this section.

| Name | Label | CBOR Type | Value Registry | Description |
|------|-------|------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| alg | 3 | tstr / int | COSE Algorithms | Signing algorithm to use |

Table 3: Common parameters of the COSE_Sign_Args structure.

- * alg: This parameter identifies the signing algorithm the additional arguments apply to. The signer MUST verify that this algorithm matches any key usage restrictions set on the key to be used. If the algorithms do not match, then the signature operation MUST be aborted with an error.

Definitions of COSE algorithms MAY define additional algorithm-specific parameters for COSE_Sign_Args.

The following CDDL example conveys additional arguments for signing data using the ESP256-split algorithm (see Section 2.1) and a key derived using ARKG-P256 [I-D.bradleylundberg-ARKG]:

```
{
  3: -65539,      ; alg: ESP256-split with ARKG-P256 (placeholder value)
                  ; ARKG-P256 key handle
                  ; (HMAC-SHA-256-128 followed by
                   SEC1 uncompressed ECDH public key)
  -1: h'27987995f184a44cfa548d104b0a461d
      0487fc739dbcdabc293ac5469221da91b220e04c681074ec4692a76ffacb9043de
      c2847ea9060fd42da267f66852e63589f0c00dc88f290d660c65a65a50c86361',
                  ; ctx argument to ARKG-Derive-Private-Key
  -2: 'ARKG-P256.test vectors',
}
```

4. Security Considerations

4.1. Protocol-Level Trusted Roles

This specification assumes that both the `_digerster_` and `_signer_` roles described in Section 2 are trusted and cooperate honestly. This is because a similar division between "application" and "secure element" typically exists already: even if all steps of the signing algorithm are executed in a trusted secure element, the inputs to the secure element are provided by some outside component such as a software application. If the application can provide any input to be signed, then for all practical purposes it is trusted with possession of any private keys for as long as it is authorized to exercise the secure element. The application can in practice obtain a signature over any chosen message without needing to perform a forgery attack. The same relationship exists between `_digerster_` and `_signer_`. Applications that cannot trust an external `_digerster_` - for example a hardware security device with an integrated secure display of what data is about to be signed - by definition have no use for split signing algorithm identifiers.

Similarly from a verifier's perspective, these split signing procedures are implementation details. When a signature is generated by a single party, that single party takes on both the `_digerster_` and the `_signer_` roles, and obviously trusts itself to perform the `_digerster_` role honestly. From the verifier's perspective, a malicious `_digerster_` in the split signing model would have the same powers as a malicious signature generator in a single-party signing model. Thus, on the application or protocol level, assuming an honest `_digerster_` is no more restrictive than assuming an honest signature generator.

4.2. Component-Level Trusted Roles

The reasoning in Section 4.1 does not hold on the component level. A `_signer_` implementation MUST NOT assume that the `_digerster_` implementation it interoperates with is necessarily honest. Split signing algorithms MUST NOT be defined in a way that enables a malicious `_digerster_` with access to an honest `_signer_` to produce forgeries - any that could not be produced by simply requesting a signature over the desired message - or extract secrets from the `_signer_`.

For example, for ECDSA (Section 2.1), a malicious `_digerster_` can choose `_H_` in such a way that the `_signer_` will derive any `_digerster_-chosen` value of `_e_`, including zero or other potentially problematic values. Fortunately, in this case, this does not enable the `_digerster_` to extract the signature nonce or private key. It also does not make forgeries easier, since the `_digerster_` still needs to find a preimage of `_e_` for the relevant hash function.

Definitions of other algorithms need to ensure that similar chosen-input attacks do not enable extracting secrets or forging protocol-level messages.

For example, a naively prehashed version of FALCON [FALCON] would allow such a key compromise: A FALCON signature is a value s such that both s and $s * h - \text{hash}(r || m)$ are short, where h is the public key and r a randomizer. If the digester gets to query the signer for signatures of arbitrary stand-ins for $\text{hash}(r || m)$, they can extract the private key by for example asking for repeated signatures of 0. Therefore, definitions of split signing algorithms need to be reviewed and potentially have security proofs adjusted.

4.3. Incorrect Use of Split Signing Algorithm Identifiers

Section 2 recommends against exposing split signing algorithm identifiers - including those defined in this specification with "-split" in their names - to signature verifiers. For example, they should not appear as the "alg" parameter of a COSE_Key public key sent to a signature verifier. If a split signing algorithm identifier is encountered in an invalid context like this, the recipient SHOULD reject the message with a fatal error.

This is because the purpose of these split signing algorithm identifiers is to enable more flexible production of signatures that can be verified by existing implementations of existing verification algorithms. A prevalence of these identifiers appearing outside the split signing context would defeat this purpose; we therefore recommend such use SHOULD NOT be tolerated.

This recommendation is the opposite of the oft-cited "robustness principle" stated in paragraph 3.9 of [RFC1958]. Implementations MAY choose to instead follow the robustness principle and tolerate incorrect use of split signing algorithm identifiers, instead interpreting the identifier as referencing the defined corresponding verification algorithm. Note however that this is no longer considered a best practice and is likely to harm interoperability [RFC9413].

A verifier's choice to tolerate or not tolerate incorrect use of split signing algorithm identifiers is expected to not affect security, assuming a split algorithm identifier is interpreted as an alias representing the same verification algorithm as a non-split algorithm identifier.

5. Implementation Considerations

5.1. Using Non-Split Signing Algorithm Identifiers in a Split Signing Protocol

A protocol designed to use split signing algorithm identifiers such as those defined in this specification MAY also allow use of algorithm identifiers that do not represent split signing algorithms. In this case, the `_signer_` performs all steps of the signing procedure as usual. For example, if the `_signer_` receives a signature request with an the algorithm identifier "ESP256", then the `_digerster_` passes the input data through unmodified and it is the `_signer_` that computes the SHA-256 digest of the input data as defined in the ESP256 definition [RFC9864].

6. IANA Considerations

6.1. COSE Algorithms Registrations

This section registers the following values in the IANA "COSE Algorithms" registry [IANA.COSE]:

- * Name: ESP256-split
 - Value: TBD (Requested Assignment -300)
 - Description: ESP256 split signing
 - Capabilities: [kty]
 - Change Controller: IETF
 - Reference: Section 2.1 of this specification
 - Recommended: Yes
- * Name: ESP384-split
 - Value: TBD (Requested Assignment -301)
 - Description: ESP384 split signing
 - Capabilities: [kty]
 - Change Controller: IETF
 - Reference: Section 2.1 of this specification
 - Recommended: Yes

- * Name: ESP512-split
 - Value: TBD (Requested Assignment -302)
 - Description: ESP512 split signing
 - Capabilities: [kty]
 - Change Controller: IETF
 - Reference: Section 2.1 of this specification
 - Recommended: Yes
- * Name: Ed25519ph
 - Value: TBD
 - Description: EdDSA using the Ed25519ph parameter set in Section 5.1 of [RFC8032]
 - Capabilities: [kty]
 - Change Controller: IETF
 - Reference: Section 5.1 of [RFC8032]
 - Recommended: Yes
- * Name: Ed25519ph-split
 - Value: TBD (Requested Assignment -303)
 - Description: Ed25519ph split as defined in Section 2.2
 - Capabilities: [kty]
 - Change Controller: IETF
 - Reference: Section 2.2 of this specification
 - Recommended: Yes
- * Name: Ed448ph
 - Value: TBD

- Description: EdDSA using the Ed448ph parameter set in Section 5.2 of [RFC8032]
- Capabilities: [kty]
- Change Controller: IETF
- Reference: Section 5.2 of [RFC8032]
- Recommended: Yes

* Name: Ed448ph-split

- Value: TBD (Requested Assignment -304)
- Description: Ed448ph split as defined in Section 2.2
- Capabilities: [kty]
- Change Controller: IETF
- Reference: Section 2.2 of this specification
- Recommended: Yes

6.2. COSE Signing Arguments Common Parameters Registry

TODO

6.3. COSE Signing Arguments Algorithm Parameters Registry

TODO

7. Implementation Status

This section is to be removed from the specification by the RFC Editor before publication as an RFC.

There are currently two known implementations using features defined by this specification:

- * wwWallet (<https://github.com/wwWallet>), an EU Digital Identity pilot project. wwWallet was entered into the "EUDI Wallet Prototypes" competition held by SprinD GmbH (<https://www.sprind.org/en/actions/challenges/eudi-wallet-prototypes>), and a branch of the wallet was submitted in the competition. The competition entry implements ARKG [I-D.bradleylundberg-ARKG] for efficiently generating single-use hardware-bound holder binding keys.

The implementation (<https://github.com/gunet/funke-s3a-wallet-frontend/blob/stage-3/src/services/keystore.ts>) uses the COSE_Key_Ref data structure defined in version 01 of this specification in order to send ARKG inputs to a WebAuthn authenticator, and uses the placeholder value for the experimental split algorithm identifier ESP256-split-ARKG defined in Section 5.2 of [I-D.bradleylundberg-ARKG] to negotiate creation and usage of ARKG-derived keys for signing operations. Thus wwWallet assumes the `_digester_` role while the WebAuthn authenticator assumes the `_signer_` role.

- * Yubico (<https://www.yubico.com/>), a hardware security key vendor, has produced limited-availability prototypes of their YubiKey product with an ARKG implementation interoperable with wwWallet. The YubiKey implementation uses the COSE_Key_Ref data structure defined in version 01 of this specification to receive ARKG inputs from a WebAuthn Relying Party, and uses the placeholder value for the experimental split algorithm identifier ESP256-split-ARKG defined in Section 5.2 of [I-D.bradleylundberg-ARKG] to negotiate creation and usage of ARKG-derived keys for signing operations. Thus the YubiKey assumes the `_signer_` role while the WebAuthn Relying Party assumes the `_digester_` role.

Table 4 summarizes implementation status for individual features.

| Feature | Defined by | Digester | Signer |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------|--------|
| ESP256-split | This specification | - | - |
| ESP384-split | This specification | - | - |
| ESP512-split | This specification | - | - |
| Ed25519ph-split | This specification | - | - |
| Ed448ph-split | This specification | - | - |
| ESP256-split-ARKG | [I-D.bradleylundberg-ARKG] | wwWallet | Yubico |
| ESP384-split-ARKG | [I-D.bradleylundberg-ARKG] | - | - |
| ESP512-split-ARKG | [I-D.bradleylundberg-ARKG] | - | - |
| COSE_Sign_Args | This specification | wwWallet | Yubico |

Table 4: Implementation status of individual features.

7.1. Dependent Specifications

As indicated in the previous section, the Internet-Draft of ARKG [I-D.bradleylundberg-ARKG] extends this specification with definitions for ARKG:

- * Section "5.2 COSE algorithms" defines COSE algorithm identifiers ESP256-split-ARKG, ESP384-split-ARKG and ESP512-split-ARKG based on the ECDSA identifiers defined in this specification (Section 2.1).
- * Section "5.3 COSE signing arguments" defines a representation for ARKG arguments using the COSE_Sign_Args data structure defined in this specification (Section 3).

8. References

8.1. Normative References

[I-D.bradleylundberg-ARKG]

Lundberg, E. and J. Bradley, "The Asynchronous Remote Key Generation (ARKG) algorithm", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-bradleylundberg-cfrg-arkg-09, 7 July 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-bradleylundberg-cfrg-arkg-09>>.

[IANA.COSE]

IANA, "CBOR Object Signing and Encryption (COSE)", n.d., <<https://www.iana.org/assignments/cose/>>.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2119>>.

[RFC8032] Josefsson, S. and I. Liusvaara, "Edwards-Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (EdDSA)", RFC 8032, DOI 10.17487/RFC8032, January 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8032>>.

[RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8174>>.

[RFC8610] Birkholz, H., Vigano, C., and C. Bormann, "Concise Data Definition Language (CDDL): A Notational Convention to Express Concise Binary Object Representation (CBOR) and JSON Data Structures", RFC 8610, DOI 10.17487/RFC8610, June 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8610>>.

[RFC9052] Schaad, J., "CBOR Object Signing and Encryption (COSE): Structures and Process", STD 96, RFC 9052, DOI 10.17487/RFC9052, August 2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9052>>.

[RFC9864] Jones, M.B. and O. Steele, "Fully-Specified Algorithms for JSON Object Signing and Encryption (JOSE) and CBOR Object Signing and Encryption (COSE)", RFC 9864, DOI 10.17487/RFC9864, October 2025, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9864>>.

[SEC1] Certicom Research, "SEC 1: Elliptic Curve Cryptography", May 2009, <<https://www.secg.org/sec1-v2.pdf>>.

8.2. Informative References

- [FALCON] Fouque, P., Hoffstein, J., Kirchner, P., Lyubashevsky, V., Pornin, T., Prest, T., Ricosset, T., Seiler, G., Whyte, W., and Z. Zhang, "FALCON: Fast-Fourier Lattice-based Compact Signatures over NTRU", 2017, <<https://falcon-sign.info/>>.
- [FIPS-186-5] National Institute of Standards and Technology, "Digital Signature Standard (DSS)", February 2023, <<https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/FIPS/NIST.FIPS.186-5.pdf>>.
- [FIPS-201] Ferraiuolo, H., Mehta, K., Francomacaro, S., Chandramouli, R., and S. Gupta, "Interfaces for Personal Identity Verification: Part 2 PIV Card Application Card Command Interface", NIST Special Publication (SP) NIST SP 800-73pt2-5, 2024, <<https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.800-73pt2-5>>.
- [FIPS-204] National Institute of Standards and Technology, "Module-Lattice-Based Digital Signature Standard", August 2024, <<https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/FIPS/NIST.FIPS.204.pdf>>.
- [I-D.COSE-Hash-Envelope] Steele, O., Lasker, S., and H. Birkholz, "COSE Hash Envelope", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-cose-hash-envelope-10, 15 November 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-cose-hash-envelope-10>>.
- [OPENPGPCARD] Pietig, A., "Functional Specification of the OpenPGP application on ISO Smart Card Operating Systems", Version 3.4.1, March 2020, <<https://gnupg.org/ftp/specs/OpenPGP-smart-card-application-3.4.1.pdf>>.
- [PKCS11-Spec-v3.1] Bong, D. and T. Cox, "PKCS #11 Specification Version 3.1.", OASIS Standard, 23 July 2023, <<https://docs.oasis-open.org/pkcs11/pkcs11-spec/v3.1/os/pkcs11-spec-v3.1-os.html>>. Latest stage: <https://docs.oasis-open.org/pkcs11/pkcs11-spec/v3.1/pkcs11-spec-v3.1.html> (<https://docs.oasis-open.org/pkcs11/pkcs11-spec/v3.1/pkcs11-spec-v3.1.html>).

- [RFC1958] Carpenter, B., Ed., "Architectural Principles of the Internet", RFC 1958, DOI 10.17487/RFC1958, June 1996, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1958>>.
- [RFC9380] Faz-Hernandez, A., Scott, S., Sullivan, N., Wahby, R. S., and C. A. Wood, "Hashing to Elliptic Curves", RFC 9380, DOI 10.17487/RFC9380, August 2023, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9380>>.
- [RFC9413] Thomson, M. and D. Schinazi, "Maintaining Robust Protocols", RFC 9413, DOI 10.17487/RFC9413, June 2023, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9413>>.
- [RFC9881] Massimo, J., Kampanakis, P., Turner, S., and B. E. Westerbaan, "Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure -- Algorithm Identifiers for the Module-Lattice-Based Digital Signature Algorithm (ML-DSA)", RFC 9881, DOI 10.17487/RFC9881, October 2025, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9881>>.
- [SECDSA] Verheul, E., "SECDSA: Mobile signing and authentication under classical "sole control"", July 2021, <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2021/910>>.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Ilari Liusvaara, Lucas Prabel, Sophie Schmieg and Falko Strenzke for their reviews of and contributions to this specification.

Document History

-05

- * Fixed ESP384-split misspelled as ESP381-split.
- * Clarified that non-"-split" alg IDs defined here may be exposed to verifiers.
- * Clarified that transport of digest is out of scope, but expected to be passed as data to be signed.
- * Added Security Considerations section "Incorrect Use of Split Signing Algorithm Identifiers".
- * Added Implementation Considerations section "Using Non-Split Signing Algorithm Identifiers in a Split Signing Protocol".

- * Added section "Defining Split Signing Algorithms" with guidance for handling domain separation tags in new definitions.
- * Clarified in introduction that Ed25519 and Ed25519ph(-split) have distinct verification algorithms.
- * Clarified in section "Protocol-Level Trusted Roles" why digester is necessarily trusted.
- * Clarified in section "Component-Level Trusted Roles" that redundant forgeries are acceptable, and added example of key compromise concern for naively hashed FALCON.

-04

- * Added Implementation Status section.

-03

- * Updated reference to ARKG parameter info renamed to ctx.
- * Refined abstract and introduction to emphasize that the central novelty is not split algorithms as a concept, but providing COSE algorithm identifiers for use cases that benefit from such splitting.
- * Replaced reference to draft-ietf-jose-fully-specified-algorithms with RFC 9864.
- * Added inline definitions of Ed25519ph and Ed448ph registrations, replacing speculative references to registrations that do not exist elsewhere.
- * Added missing captions to Tables 1 and 2.
- * Added Security Considerations section.

-02

- * Renamed document from "COSE Algorithms for Two-Party Signing" to "Split signing algorithms for COSE" and updated introduction and terminology accordingly.
- * Dropped definitions for HashML-DSA, as split variants of ML-DSA are being actively discussed in other IETF groups.
- * Changed "Base algorithm" heading in definition tables to "Verification algorithm".

- * Remodeled COSE_Key_Ref as COSE_Sign_Args.
- Dropped definitions of reference types for COSE Key Types registry.

-01

- * Added IANA registration requests for algorithms defined.
- * Updated references and other editorial tweaks.

-00

- * Initial individual draft

Authors' Addresses

Emil Lundberg (editor)
Yubico
Gvlegatan 22
Stockholm
Sweden
Email: emil@emlun.se

Michael B. Jones
Self-Issued Consulting
United States
Email: michael_b_jones@hotmail.com
URI: <https://self-issued.info/>