Discussion Outline for the **ipp-notify-send** Delivery Method

- Issue 1: What would the name of this delivery method and protocol be that we use in the title of this document?

  Considerations:
  A. The IESG prefers complete words or well-known acronyms.
  B. It should be representative of the method's current and future capabilities and operation.

  Discuss possible extensions.

  Consider potential names.
  A. ipp notify send protocol / delivery method
  B. ipp push notification protocol / delivery method
  C. ipp asynchronous notification protocol / delivery method
  D. ipp notification over http protocol / delivery method
  E. ipp unsolicited notification protocol / delivery method
  F. … others …

  I like E, C, and B above, in that order.

- Issue 2: What should the scheme name be?

  Does the IESG have anything to say about scheme names? If not, I propose we use a somewhat abbreviated version of the method's full name.

	- Shorter -	- Longer -	
A.	ipp-ntfy-send	ipp-notify-send	
B.	ipp-push-ntfy	ipp-push-notify	
C.	ipp-async-ntfy	ipp-async-notify	ipp-asynchronous-notify
D.	ipp-ntfy-http	ipp-notify-http	
E.	ipp-unsolicited-ntfy	ipp-unoscilited-notify	
F.	… others …		

  I like the short versions of C and B above.

- Issue 3: Should the scheme name be used in the title?

  Preferably so, but It depends on how long and awkward of a name we come up with.

- Issue 4: "human-readable-report" has been added to the [ipp-ntfy] Notification Model document, so ok to change this description to be a reference to "human-readable-report" in [ipp-ntfy]?

  My take: Yes.

- Wording question: Last paragraph in section 4.1.1 is hard to read.

- Issue 5: Should we move the status codes into the Notification Model document in order to have the same status codes for any other delivery method that might be defined?

  My take: Yes.

- Security Question: Why do some think the section on security is not complete?