Parameters & Defaults:

Should we specify rather than recommend default values?

TAPS

IETF 105 - Montreal

Michael Welzl

Parameters & Defaults:

Should we specify rather than recommend default values?

TAPS

IETF 105 - Montreal

Michael Welzl

https://github.com/ietf-tapswg/api-drafts/pull/317

The proposal is:

s/The recommended default is.../The default MUST be..."

Discussion so far:

- Depends on properties: e.g., MUST for "Notification of ICMP soft errors" ?

  ...But probably good for reliability, ordering, etc.

  → if we agree on MUST, we'll probably have to discuss requirements levels for each default as we proceed.

- Relates to policy, which may e.g. override a "MUST"?

That's all ☺ nothing to see here!

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!