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Update Status (-01)

I. Added some explanation clarifying the nomenclature CATEGORY.[SUBCATEGORY].PRIMITIVENAME.PROTOCOL
   – CATEGORY: CONNECTION, DATA
   – CONNECTION SUBCATEGORY: ESTABLISHMENT, AVAILABILITY, MAINTENANCE and TERMINATION

II. MPTCP is included in 3-pass process (contribution from Christoph Paasch @ Apple)
   – Based on RFC6182, RFC6824 and RFC6897
   – Provides some additional services in Pass #3 e.g. add subflow, remove subflow, disable MPTCP

   – Change of “rules” to allow Experimental RFCs (else MPTCP could not be included)
Discussion follow-up from IETF 95 (re: (D)TLS Section)

• Feedback from TLS chairs:
  – Lots of documents incorporate TLS without describing an API
  – Lots of features deployed for different applications that aren’t described in the TLS spec.
  – TLS has lots of options that rely on X.509/PKIX making it more complex to define an API magnifying the trade-off between defining a rich vs basic API

• After discussions with TLS and TAPS chairs, ADs and on UTA/TAPS MLs, we think we don't currently have the expertise/energy within TAPS to write the section.
Future Plan

• SCTP beyond RFC 4960
  – RFC6458, covering RFC3758, RFC895, RFC5061
  – RFC7496, RFC6525, RFC6951, RFC7053, RFC7829

• TCP: Experimental RFCs
  – RFC7413 (TFO); any other? will check...

• DCCP (Marie-Jose Montpetit)