

draft-ietf-taps- transport-security

Waiting for AD Go-Ahead::AD Followup **for 22 days**

Document State

- WG-Last Call in July 
- Shepherd writeup and AD review 
- Reviews from GENART and SECDIR: Ready 
- IANA review: OK - No Actions Needed 
- “should be published in its current form”
from two honorable individuals 

Criticism I: Skepticism towards TAPS idea

- Too ambitious task
- Pushes against integration trends, e.g., for QUIC stacks
- Application developers want full control, no automagic abstraction
- ▶ Do we need to have this argument over and over again?
- ▶ How can we scope our work better?

Criticism IIa:

Security protocols are special

- Security protocols must be integrated into the application
- Should / MUST NOT be automated within a TAPS system
- Transport and Network Security are fundamentally different
- ▶ TAPS without Transport Security is useless!
- ▶ Explain security contracts provided by TAPS and that there are different ways to fulfil them.
- ▶ Scope our work better.

Criticism II:

Security work outside SEC area

- Document is clearly in Security scope, but does not define a new security (network) protocol
- TAPS is the only consumer of this work (yet)
 - Asking the security area to write the document for us is not how the IETF works.
- ▶ We asked for early review from SEC area
- ▶ We involved people from SEC area

Criticism III:

Mixed bad of things

- For the transport protocols, we had three documents:
Summary: RFC 8303 + RFC 8304
API Requirements: MINSET (MISSREF for 413 days)
- For transport-security, we decided to go with one document for summary and API requirements
 - Most of the document covers protocol summary
 - API requirements follow from protocol summary
- ▶ Is this the right structure?

How to continue?