

Transport Options for UDP

draft-ietf-tsvwg-udp-options-32

<https://github.com/tsvwg/draft-ietf-tsvwg-udp-options/issues>

Issues That Are Resolved and Should Be Closed

[IANA evaluation response](#)

#28 opened 2024-03-16 (Resolved in next rev)

[Should UDP ExIDs be distinct from TCP ExIDs, or use a common namespace?](#)

#29 opened 2024-03-17 (Resolved in next rev)

[WGLC Comments on Frag](#)

#30 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev, citing possible use case)

[Med: WGLC Comments on RES/REQ](#)

#31 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved)

[GF/CMH/ZS: WGLC Comments - Use cases](#)

#42 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev, citing possible use case)

Issues That Are Resolved and Should Be Closed

[Med: WGLC Comments on Magic Number?](#)

#32 opened 2024-04-12 (Closed - resolved)

[Tom H: WGLC comments on Section 7: Surplus area](#)

#38 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev)

[Tom H: WGLC Additions to terminology in Section 3](#)

#35 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev)

[Tom H: WGLC comments on Section 12: "UNSAFE options are not safe to ignore"](#)

#40 opened 2024-04-28 (Resolved in next rev, definitions to be added)

[Tom H: WGLC comments on Section 7: OCS](#)

#37 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev, Change "Next HDR" to "Next Header" to be consistent with RFC8200)

Issues That Are Resolved and Should Be Closed

[Tom H: WGLC comments on Appendix A](#)

#41 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

[ZS/CMH: Backwards compatibility with UDP](#)

#43 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

[CMH: Apply "first instance only" rule to options received in fragments as well as in the surplus area](#)

#47 opened 2024-04-21 Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

[CMH: Instructions on order of option processing](#)

#46 opened 2024-04-21 Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

[CMH: Clarify that EOL indicates the end the options in the per-fragment option area just as it does in the per-datagram surplus area](#)

#49 opened 2024-04-21 Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

[CMH: Clarify that EOL indicates the end the options in the per-fragment option area just as it does in the per-datagram surplus area](#)

#50 opened 2024-04-22 Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

Issues That Are Resolved and Should Be Closed

[CMH: Clarification for FRAG Option Corner Cases](#)

#51 opened 2024-04-22 (Resolved in next rev)

[MD/CMH: Change minimum reassembled UDP datagram size from 3000 to 2926](#)

#52 opened 2024-04-22

Suggestion: Change minimum reassembled UDP datagram size from 3000 to 2926

[CMH: Simplify language stating that FRAG is not reported to the user.](#)

#53 opened 2024-04-22

Suggestion: Accept or reject proposed change and close after WG review..

[CMH: Clarify the exact meaning of MRDS size](#)

#54 opened 2024-04-22 (Resolved in next rev)

Issues That Are Resolved and Should Be Closed

[MD/CMH: Remove misleading stray text from Section 11.6](#)

#55 opened 2024-04-22 (Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

[Erik: Inconsistency in Security Considerations regarding not passing FRAG, NOP, and EOL to the upper layer](#)

#56 opened 2024-04-28 (Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

[Erik: correct or remove erroneous note in Step 3 of the fragmentation procedure \(Section 11.4\)](#)

#57 opened 2024-04-28 (Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

Issues Needing Action

APC

Tom H: WGLC comments on design of APC and Auth

#34 opened 2024-04-12

Tom H: WGLC comments on Section 11.3: APC Title; combination of APC & OCS; and silently ignore when failing

#39 opened 2024-04-12

Tom H: WGLC comments on Section 11.9: Authentication

#58 opened 2024-04-28

Discussion: These issues, all related, editors to propose a resolution for WG

Transit Nodes

WGLC: Is it OK for the endpoints to send information in UDP options which can be read (only) by the transit nodes and react to it?

#45 opened 2024-04-12

Proposal: Accept text, and confirm this is OK.