# cose+cbor vs +cwt

Michael Richardson,

IETF 116 COSE Working Group

## RFC8366bis/ I-D.animaconstrained-voucher

Registers application/voucher-cose+cbor

```
*Looks like:
COSE_Sign1(
[
h'a10126', #{ "alg": EDdsa 256 }
{
   "crv": Ed25519,
   "kty": OKP,
   "key_ops": "verify"
},
{ 1025: { 1: "something", 2: "else" } } # binary, according to YANG-SID h'456', #voucher-request binary public signature
]
)
```

### I-D.rats-eat

#### Registers application/eat+cwt

```
Looks like:
18(
       / protected / << {</pre>
        / alg / 1: -7 / ECDSA 256 /
       } >>,
       / unprotected / {
        / kid / 4: h'4173796d6d657472696345434453413
                      23536' / 'AsymmetricECDSA256' /
       },
       / payload / << {
        / iss / 1: "coap://as.example.com", / sub / 2: "erikw", / aud / 3:
"coap://light.example.com",
        / exp / 4: 1444064944, / nbf / 5: 1443944944, / iat / 6: 1443944944, / cti / 7: h'0b71'
       } >>,
       / signature / h'5427c1ff28d23fbad1f29c4c7c6a555e601d6fa29f
                       9179bc3d7438bacaca5acd08c8d4d4f96131680c42
                       9a01f85951ecee743a52b9b63632c57209120e1c9e
                       30'
```

#### QUESTIONS?

- Are they sufficiently different?
  - •Is it -cose+cbor, or -cbor+cose?
    - Does anyone are?