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Timeline

• FEB 2020: WGLC completed
• JUL 2021: Draft-12 submitted to IESG
• JAN 2022: AD (Ben) feedback
  • https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/teep/2LQNklErJOx2MyftwUL61rM7GlU/
• FEB 2022: Updated draft-13 to address AD feedback
  • https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/teep/DW_H2BspNVdlkdk64d7cbL6zYg/
DoS possible by REE – addressed in arch doc

Added to security considerations of transport draft:

- See section 9 of [I-D.ietf-teep-architecture] for security considerations specific to the use of TEEP.
HTTP references

- For HTTP procedures to verify authenticity of server
  - Replaced RFC 6125 with the more specific draft-ietf-httpbis-semantics#section-4.3.4 (which cites RFC 6125), in RFC Ed Queue

- RFC 6125 and RFC 7525 have active “bis” drafts in UTA but are only drafts
  - Could pull in later if available before RFC but otherwise leave as is
Other notable feedback

• Removed leftover text implying there might be more than one TEEP media type
• “SHOULD” fail request if wrong Content-Type received even though BCP56bis doesn’t require it
  • No change since SHOULD previously passed WGLC
  • Useful to prevent bugs and encourage TEEP protocol interoperability
• Added TAM URI to UnrequestTA abstract API for consistency with RequestTA
• Various other editorial wordsmithings accepted as Ben suggested