SPPP Transport

Session Peering Provisioning Protocol

draft-ietf-drinks-sppp-over-soap-04

Progress

- WGLC was issued in April

- Comments received from Manjul Maharishi
  - <u>Comment</u>: Suggested additional explanation of the overall structure, using Document Literal Wrapped WSDL style and SOAP.
  - Action: Updated the text describing the use of the Document Literal Wrapped style of WSDL and SOAP.
  - <u>Comment</u>: References need to be tightened up.
  - Action: Improved the references section (SOAP, WSDL, HTTP)
  - <u>Comment</u>: Spelling and grammar improvements.
  - Action: Cleaned up some spelling and grammar.

- Issued updated draft, 04.

Progress

- **Comments received from Peter Saint-Andre** (received late last week, so no action taken yet)
  - <u>Comment</u>: A few sentences need to to be updated for clarity.
  - <u>Comment</u>: The selected normative reference for WSDL is inappropriate, not supporting the statement that WSDL is standardized and widely adopted.
  - <u>Comment</u>: When mentioning that SOAP faults are not being explicitly used within SPPP SOAP mapping, refer to an appropriate section of the SOAP specification, or describe how SOAP faults would be handled if they do occur.
  - <u>Comment</u>: Make the text more explicit where it states that implementations must support HTTP over TLS.
  - <u>Comment</u>: Ensure that the WSDL name spaces are correctly specified.
  - <u>Comment</u>: When stating that the "client SHOULD authenticate the server" provide a reference to how this could/should be done (e.g. reference 2818).
  - <u>Comment</u>: Where section 7.3 states that encryption "may" not be used in some closed networks or debugging scenarios, improve the wording and meaning.
  - <u>Comment</u>: Improve the IANA considerations section, and refer to RFC 3688 on how to do so.

Next Steps

- Address Peter's Comments.
- Go to next last call.