Note Well

- **Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution".** Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:
  - The IETF plenary session
  - The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
  - **Any IETF mailing list**, including the IETF list itself, any **working group** or design team list,
    - or any other list functioning under IETF auspices
  - **Any IETF working group or portion thereof**
  - Any Birds of a Feather (BOF) session
  - The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
  - The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function
  - **All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).**

- Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice. Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.

- A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

- A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.
Agenda

- Note well and intro (you are here)
- J. Iyengar  A QUIC Overview (15m)
- C. Huitema  Implementing QUIC for fun and planning (10m)
- M. Ponec  QUIC deployment at Akamai (10m)
- I. Swett  QUIC deployment at Google (15m)
- M. Thomson  Using TLS for QUIC (10m)
- J. Iyengar  Proposed document organization (10m)
- Open Mic Discussion / Consensus Questions
Charter: Key Points

Define a new standards track IETF transport protocol based on deployment experience with QUIC. Four focus areas:

- Core transport work: wire format, basic mechanisms
- Security: TLS 1.3 to protect QUIC header and payload
- Application semantic mapping: initial focus on HTTP/2
- Extension to multipath for migration and load sharing

Note: consensus required both for changes to the current protocol mechanisms and retention of current mechanisms. No need to maintain wire compatibility with existing, deployed code.
Charter: Milestones

- Chartering + 3 Months: Working group adoption of Core Protocol document
- Chartering + 3 Months: Working group adoption of Loss detection and Congestion Control document
- Chartering + 3 Months: Working group adoption of TLS 1.3 mapping document
- Chartering + 3 Months: Working group adoption of HTTP/2 mapping document
- Chartering + 12 Months: Working group adoption of Multipath extension document
- Chartering + 18 Months: Core Protocol document to IESG
- Chartering + 18 Months: Loss detection and Congestion Control document to IESG
- Chartering + 18 Months: TLS 1.3 Mapping document to IESG
- Chartering + 24 Months: HTTP/2 mapping document to IESG
- Chartering + 30 Months: Multipath extension document to IESG
Consensus Questions

Is the problem statement clear, well-scoped, solvable, and useful to solve? (yes/no)

Who is willing to review documents or comment to the list? (show of hands)

Who is willing to edit documents? (show of hands)

Should the IETF form a WG with the charter discussed today? (yes/no)