

Property Profiles & Explicit Protocol Selection

TAPS

IETF 105 - Montreal

Michael Welzl

First things first:

We should (discourage but..) allow
to specify a protocol.

Any reasons against this?

Next: how do we do this.

Forcing the use of a specific protocol

<https://github.com/ietf-tapswg/api-drafts/pull/327>

- Should the protocol choice be a transport property or is it chosen for a local endpoint?
- If local endpoint: would need to ensure compatible transport properties too....
 - But this could be done efficiently with **profiles**
 - Profiles specify a combination of properties; can yield a UDP-like protocol, but that does not mean "UDP".

Profiles <https://github.com/ietf-tapswg/api-drafts/pull/328>

Example: ## reliable-inorder-stream

This profile provides reliable, in-order transport service with congestion control. An example of a protocol that provides this service is TCP. It should consist of the following properties:

Property	Value
:-----	:-----
reliability	require
preserve-order	require
congestion-control	require
preserve-msg-boundaries	ignore

Q: Where to put what? Normative part vs. appendix?

That's all 😊 nothing to see here!