

# draft-gjessing-taps-minset-02

S. Gjessing, M. Welzl

neat

TAPS @ IETF 96

# Context (reminder)

- Charter item 2:

“Specify the subset of those Transport Services, as identified in item 1, that end systems supporting TAPS will provide, and give guidance on choosing among available mechanisms and protocols. Note that not all the capabilities of IETF Transport protocols need to be exposed as Transport Services.”

- Abstraction = trade-off: TAPS identifies more services than we used to have, yet exposing everything complicates the API and may not always be necessary
  - this draft documents these trade-offs

# Categorization (reminder)

- Functional (e.g. Unordered message delivery)
  - provide functionality that cannot be used without the application knowing about them, or else they violate assumptions that might cause the application to fail
- Optimizing (e.g. Change DSCP)
  - Can't use without application-specific knowledge (*now defined: knowledge that only applications have*), but won't make an application "fail" (note: best effort)
- Automatable (e.g. Set Primary Path)
  - Could be used without application-specific knowledge

# Notable changes

- Two major decisions (Transport Service Features made “Automatable”) explained in new section
  - Multi-streaming
  - Multiple paths
- Category “DELETED” removed (redundant)
- Brief implementation hints almost everywhere
- Incorporate some fixes that were applied to step 3 of draft-ietf-taps-transport-usage-01 (i.e.: based on -01 without MPTCP)