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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".
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reliability</td>
<td>require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preserve-order</td>
<td>require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congestion-control</td>
<td>require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preserve-msg-boundaries</td>
<td>ignore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: Where to put what? Normative part vs. appendix?
That's all 😊 nothing to see here!