

# **EAT Media Types**

**draft-ietf-rats-eat-media-type-05**

**RATS WG, IETF 119, Brisbane**

# Quick recap

# New Media Types

Name	Template
EAT CWT	application/eat+cwt
EAT JWT	application/eat+jwt
Detached EAT Bundle CBOR	application/eat-bun+cbor
Detached EAT Bundle JSON	application/eat-bun+json
EAT UCCS	application/eat-ucs+cbor
EAT UJCS	application/eat-ucs+json

# New Structured Syntax Suffix

+cwt, to indicate that the media type is encoded as a CWT.

(Parallel to +jwt defined in [§7.2 of RFC8417](#))

# WGLC recap

- No on-list feedback (somewhat expected given the purely bureaucratic nature of the document)
- Giri's [[Issue#17](#)] and [[PR#18](#)]
  - *"[d]iscussion of when it might be appropriate not to use the media types [...]"*
  - Please chime in
- Kathleen's [shepherd review](#)
  - Clean up stale contents

# Next Steps

- Publish -06
- Request early allocations
- Send to AD/IESG

# Early Allocation Questionnaire

- ✓ The code points must be from a space designated as "RFC Required", "IETF Review", or "Standards Action". Additionally, requests for early assignment of code points from a "Specification Required" registry are allowed if the specification will be published as an RFC.
- ✓ The format, semantics, processing, and other rules related to handling the protocol entities defined by the code points (henceforth called "specifications") must be adequately described in an Internet-Draft.
- ✓ The specifications of these code points must be stable; i.e., if there is a change, implementations based on the earlier and later specifications must be seamlessly interoperable.
- ? The Working Group chairs and Area Directors (ADs) judge that there is sufficient interest in the community for early (pre-RFC) implementation and deployment, or that failure to make an early allocation might lead to contention for the code point in the field.



**FIN**