Transport Options for UDP

draft-ietf-tsvwg-udp-options
J. Touch

TSVWG

IETF 119

Brisbane, March 2024

Document Status

- All remaining Github issues have been closed

- -32 (to be posted) will capture all issue resolutions noted in Github

- That version should be suitable for the 2nd WGLC

- Lingering disagreements will be resolved via discussion on the list

Disposition of Github Issues in -32 (1/3)

- #5: *Is AUTH sufficiently mature for LC as PS?*
- #6: *UENC downref?*
  - AUTH and UENC (and now UCMP for compression) are kept as placeholders and used as examples for discussion but are not defined. The code points are marked reserved with the intended future use documented.
  - Former descriptions are now in draft-touch-tsvwg-udp-auth-opt

- #25: *Reduce implementation complexity by limiting per-fragment options to specific ones and fixing per-fragment option placement*
  - UCMP is an example of an option that must precede FRAG
  - All options now have explicit instructions on how they should be handled if received in fragments, and this is now required of all new options

Disposition of Github Issues in -32 (2/3)

- #23: *UNSAFE should not be limited to options that modify user data*
- #21: *Processing requirements of APC and AUTH options*
  - Normative definition of UNSAFE in Section 13 did not raise controversy
  - Updates to descriptive text in Sections 10 and 11 deemed too vague
  - APC and AUTH remain SAFE options, to be used as building blocks
  - APC to be renamed "Additional Payload Checksum" to clarify this

- #26: *Address IPv6 Jumbograms*
  - Text has been added stating that UDP options cannot be supported when a UDP packet has no independent UDP Length
  - RFC 2675 cited as the only known example

Disposition of Github Issues in -32 (3/3)

- #24: *The API extensions for UDP Options must allow UDP fragmentation to be on or off for any send request*
- #23: *NiTs on draft-ietf-tsvwg-udp-options-28*
- #18: *Add design principles per IETF 117 slide deck*
  - All of the above were editorial in nature and will be fixed in -32

Next Steps

- WGLC expected on -32 after IETF 119

- Please review that draft carefully and comment on the list

- THANK YOU.