

**draft-ietf-quic-manageability-03**

**draft-ietf-quic-applicability-03**

Mirja Kühlewind and Brian Trammell (remote or offline)

Nov 4, 2018, IETF 103 Bangkok

# Updates: manageability

- New section on "Use of Port Numbers" (issue #26)
- Illustration of QUIC handshake added (issue #35)
- Extended security considerations
  
- Currently no open issues!

# Updates: applicability

- New section on "Port Selection" (issue #26)
  - Do we want to say more, e.g. more general guidance or recommendations for using ALPN in QUIC mappings?
  - Input from HTTP flows welcome!
- New section on "Session resumption versus Keep-alive" (issue #37)
- New section on "Mitigating Timing Linkability with Connection ID Migration" (issue #31)
- Rework of section on "Information exposure and the Connection ID"
- Pending PRs for -04 -> Thanks Martin Thomson!
  - New section on "Enabling New Versions" (issue #28)
    - Should this also say something about migration from gQUIC? (issue #25)
  - New section on "Flow Control Deadlocks" (moved from transport draft)

# Open issues: applicability

- Is more guidance on selection/generation of connection IDs needed? (issues #11 and #29)
  - e.g. is it recommended to include a MAC?
  - Input needed!
- Text on error handling for application-visible errors? (issue #14)
  - Input needed!
- Explain emulation of partial reliability with one message per stream? (issue #15)
- Connection IDs and ICMP Error messages (for PMTU discovery) (issue #23)
  - Explaining "MAY" is transport draft...

# Interface questions: applicability

- How to handle rejected 0-RTT data - withdraw or retransmit? (issue #13)
  - Probably HTTP author needed!
- Maybe say something about in-order delivery (in streams) (issue #39)
  - Transport draft says "Implementations MAY choose to offer the ability to deliver data out of order."
  - What should we recommend here?
  - Input needed!
- Provide interface for configuring fixed packet size (issue #30)
  - Does this belong in the applicability draft?
- Creation of the address validation token (issue #40)
  - Is it sufficient to just provide a pointer to <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc5077#section-4> (Recommended Ticket Construction for TLS)?