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 noes 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 the 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?