

# neat

## Update on draft-ietf-taps-transport-usage

Michael Welzl, Michael Tuexen and Naeem Khademi

TAPS WG - IETF 96

Berlin- Germany

21 July 2016



# Update Status (-01)

- I. Added some explanation clarifying the nomenclature  
CATEGORY.[SUBCATEGORY].PRIMITIVENAME.PROTOCOL
    - **CATEGORY:** CONNECTION, DATA
    - **CONNECTION SUBCATEGORY:** ESTABLISHMENT, AVAILABILITY, MAINTENANCE and TERMINATION
  
  - II. MPTCP is included in 3-pass process (contribution from Christoph Paasch @ Apple)
    - Based on RFC6182, RFC6824 and RFC6897
    - Provides some additional services in Pass #3 e.g. add subflow, remove subflow, disable MPTCP
- Change of “rules” to allow Experimental RFCs (else MPTCP could not be included)

# Discussion follow-up from IETF 95 (re: (D)TLS Section)

- Feedback from TLS chairs:
  - Lots of documents incorporate TLS without describing an API
  - Lots of features deployed for different applications that aren't described in the TLS spec.
  - TLS has lots of options that rely on X.509/PKIX making it more complex to define an API magnifying the trade-off between defining a rich vs basic API
- After discussions with TLS and TAPS chairs, ADs and on UTA/TAPS MLs, we think we don't currently have the expertise/energy within TAPS to write the section.

# Future Plan

- SCTP beyond RFC 4960
  - RFC6458, covering RFC3758, RFC895, RFC5061
  - RFC7496, RFC6525, RFC6951, RFC7053, RFC7829
- TCP: Experimental RFCs
  - RFC7413 (TFO); any other? will check...
- DCCP (Marie-Jose Montpetit)

