

MEDIAMAN WG Meeting

IETF 112, Tuesday, November 9, 1430-1530 UTC

Making the Internet work better



Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (<https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/>) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPS. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

- [BCP 9](#) (Internet Standards Process)
- [BCP 25](#) (Working Group processes)
- [BCP 25](#) (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- [BCP 54](#) (Code of Conduct)
- [BCP 78](#) (Copyright)
- [BCP 79](#) (Patents, Participation)
- <https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/>(Privacy Policy)

Agenda

1. Introduction, Note Well, scribe, agenda bash (5 min)
2. Principles for new Top Level types (15 min)
Presentation of problem space (Harald): 5 min
Discussion (10 min)
3. Top level type "Haptics" (15 min)
Presentation of problem space (Muthusamy): 5 min
Discussion (10 min)
4. Multiple suffixes for media types (15 min)
Presentation of problem space (Manu Sporny): 5 min
Discussion (10 min)
5. Wrapup, action items, followup (10 min)

MIME types: History

- Developed in 1991-1992 for mail usage (RFC 1341)
- Adopted by HTTP and RTP
- Registration procedures broken out in 1996 (RFC 2048)
- Revised in RFC 4288 (2005)
- Revised in RFC 6838 (2013)

Many attempts at directing their usage.
The world does as the world does.

MIME types: Directions

- 1991: flat space vs hierarchical (settled on 2-level)
- 1996: faceted: vnd. / prs. / standards (largely seen as failure)
- 2001-2005: structured suffixes - +xml (RFC 3023)

Top level types

- The original: text, image, video, audio, application, message
- Model (RFC 2077, 1997)
- Example (RFC 4735, 2006) - for examples only
- Font (RFC 8081, 2017)

New top level types are a rare occurrence. Why we do them is still unclear. Success metrics for these is also hard to come by.

Success criteria for this WG

If, after the WG is concluded, we have something we can point to that says “this is how we decide if we need a top level type”, we’ve succeeded.

Even if the text says only “there is no rule; the decider decides what the decider decides.”

I do think we can do slightly better than that.

Q1: Do we need a new registration procedure for top level types?

Possible answers:

- Yes
- No
- Too little information to decide

Q2: Should we adopt the “haptics” draft?

Adoption as a WG document does not mean agreeing to any specific text in the document.

Possible answers:

- Yes
- No
- Not enough information to decide at this time

Q3: Should we adopt the “suffixes” draft?

Possible answers:

- Yes
- No
- Not enough information to decide at this time