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Summary

• Adopted as WG document
• Document moved to WG github
  • [https://github.com/ietf-teep/otrp-over-http](https://github.com/ietf-teep/otrp-over-http)
• Github issues used for issue tracking
• Three issues filed:
  1. Terminology alignment on transport layer implementation
  2. HTTP Bindings
  3. Move media type to OTrP spec (DONE)
Issue #3: Move media type to OTrP spec

• Problem:
  • Previously application/otrp+json was normative in transport spec
  • Transport doesn’t actually care what the content is, just passes to OTrP
  • Interest in OTrP also supporting CBOR, without changing transport spec

• Solution:
  • Made Content-Type value informative in transport spec
  • All normative content and IANA considerations moved to OTrP spec

• Status: DONE
Issue #1: Terminology alignment

• Arch doc has green terms
  • “TEEP Broker” is arch doc’s name for **REE application**, independent of protocol

• Is Broker the right term for OTrP-over-HTTP?

• Layer of TEE/REE split might vary by implementation
  • What if HTTP(S) Client is inside TEE, so Broker just does TCP/QUIC layer?
  • What if TAM is not inside a TEE, so nothing to “broker”?
Issue #2: HTTP Bindings (1/2)

Current model:

Anders asks about:

[Diagram showing HTTP and OTrP interactions between TAM, FW or NAT, TEEP Agent, and Device (e.g., phone) for both the current model and Anders's question.]
Issue #2: HTTP Bindings (2/2)

• OTrP is most applicable when the entity wanting the TA installed (e.g., a user) is different from the entity authorizing TA installs (e.g., TAM admin)
  • Does that happen today in a cloud case?

• Options:
  A. Do nothing
  B. Punt to future work, but update title of this doc
  C. Start on separate doc, and update title of this doc
  D. Work on now, in same doc
Questions?

• Anything else?