

Congestion and Pre-Congestion  
Notification Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: August 11, 2008

Philip. Eardley (Editor)  
BT  
February 8, 2008

Pre-Congestion Notification Architecture  
draft-ietf-pcn-architecture-03

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on August 11, 2008.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2008).

Abstract

The purpose of this document is to describe a general architecture for flow admission and termination based on pre-congestion information in order to protect the quality of service of established inelastic flows within a single DiffServ domain.

Internet-Draft

Document

February 2008

Status

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Terminology . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Assumptions and constraints on scope . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
3.1.	Assumption 1: Trust and support of PCN - controlled environment . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
3.2.	Assumption 2: Real-time applications . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
3.3.	Assumption 3: Many flows and additional load . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
3.4.	Assumption 4: Emergency use out of scope . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
3.5.	Other assumptions . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	High-level functional architecture . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
4.1.	Flow admission . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
4.2.	Flow termination . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
4.3.	Flow admission and flow termination . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
4.4.	Information transport . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
4.5.	PCN-traffic . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Detailed Functional architecture . . . . .	<a href="#">16</a>
5.1.	PCN-interior-node functions . . . . .	<a href="#">17</a>
5.2.	PCN-ingress-node functions . . . . .	<a href="#">17</a>
5.3.	PCN-egress-node functions . . . . .	<a href="#">18</a>
5.4.	Other admission control functions . . . . .	<a href="#">19</a>
5.5.	Other flow termination functions . . . . .	<a href="#">19</a>
5.6.	Addressing . . . . .	<a href="#">20</a>
5.7.	Tunnelling . . . . .	<a href="#">21</a>
5.8.	Fault handling . . . . .	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Design goals and challenges . . . . .	<a href="#">23</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	Probing . . . . .	<a href="#">25</a>
7.1.	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">25</a>
7.2.	Probing functions . . . . .	<a href="#">26</a>
7.3.	Discussion of rationale for probing, its downsides and open issues . . . . .	<a href="#">27</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Operations and Management . . . . .	<a href="#">30</a>
8.1.	Configuration OAM . . . . .	<a href="#">30</a>
8.1.1.	System options . . . . .	<a href="#">31</a>
8.1.2.	Parameters . . . . .	<a href="#">31</a>
8.2.	Performance & Provisioning OAM . . . . .	<a href="#">33</a>
8.3.	Accounting OAM . . . . .	<a href="#">34</a>
8.4.	Fault OAM . . . . .	<a href="#">34</a>
8.5.	Security OAM . . . . .	<a href="#">35</a>

<a href="#">9.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">36</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	Security considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">36</a>
<a href="#">11.</a>	Conclusions . . . . .	<a href="#">37</a>
<a href="#">12.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">38</a>
<a href="#">13.</a>	Comments Solicited . . . . .	<a href="#">38</a>

<a href="#">14.</a>	Changes . . . . .	<a href="#">38</a>
<a href="#">14.1.</a>	Changes from -02 to -03 . . . . .	<a href="#">38</a>
<a href="#">14.2.</a>	Changes from -01 to -02 . . . . .	<a href="#">39</a>
<a href="#">14.3.</a>	Changes from -00 to -01 . . . . .	<a href="#">40</a>
15.	<a href="#">Appendix A</a> : Possible work items beyond the scope of the current PCN WG Charter . . . . .	<a href="#">42</a>
<a href="#">16.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">44</a>
	Author's Address . . . . .	<a href="#">47</a>
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . .	<a href="#">48</a>

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to describe a general architecture for flow admission and termination based on (pre-) congestion information in order to protect the quality of service of flows within a DiffServ domain [[RFC2475](#)]. This document defines an architecture for implementing two mechanisms to protect the quality of service of established inelastic flows within a single DiffServ domain, where all boundary and interior nodes are PCN-enabled and trust each other for correct PCN operation. Flow admission control determines whether a new flow should be admitted, in order to protect the QoS of existing PCN-flows in normal circumstances. However, in abnormal circumstances, for instance a disaster affecting multiple nodes and causing traffic re-routes, then the QoS on existing PCN-flows may degrade even though care was exercised when admitting those flows before those circumstances. Therefore we also propose a mechanism for flow termination, which removes enough traffic in order to protect the QoS of the remaining PCN-flows.

As a fundamental building block to enable these two mechanisms, PCN-interior-nodes generate, encode and transport pre-congestion information towards the PCN-egress-nodes. Two rates, a PCN-lower-rate and a PCN-upper-rate, can be associated with each link of the PCN-domain. Each rate is used by a marking behaviour (specified in another document) that determines how and when a number of PCN-packets are marked, and how the markings are encoded in packet headers. PCN-egress-nodes make measurements of the packet markings and send information as necessary to the nodes that make the decision about which PCN-flows to accept/reject or terminate, based on this

information. Another document will describe the decision-making behaviours. Overall the aim is to enable PCN-nodes to give an "early warning" of potential congestion before there is any significant build-up of PCN-packets in the queue; the admission control mechanism limits the PCN-traffic on each link to \*roughly\* its PCN-lower-rate and the flow termination mechanism limits the PCN-traffic on each link to \*roughly\* its PCN-upper-rate.

We believe that the key benefits of the PCN mechanisms described in this document are that they are simple, scalable, and robust because:

- o Per flow state is only required at the PCN-ingress-nodes ("stateless core"). This is required for policing purposes (to prevent non-admitted PCN traffic from entering the PCN-domain) and so on. It is not generally required that other network entities are aware of individual flows (although they may be in particular deployment scenarios).

- o Admission control is resilient: PCN's QoS is decoupled from the routing system; hence in general admitted flows can survive capacity, routing or topology changes without additional signalling, and they don't have to be told (or learn) about such changes. The PCN-lower-rates can be chosen small enough that admitted traffic can still be carried after a rerouting in most failure cases [[Menth](#)]. This is an important feature as QoS violations in core networks due to link failures are more likely than QoS violations due to increased traffic volume [[Iyer](#)].
- o The PCN-marking behaviours only operate on the overall PCN-traffic on the link, not per flow.
- o The information of these measurements is signalled to the PCN-egress-nodes by the PCN-marks in the packet headers, ie "in-band". No additional signalling protocol is required for transporting the PCN-marks. Therefore no secure binding is required between data packets and separate congestion messages.
- o The PCN-egress-nodes make separate measurements, operating on the aggregate PCN-traffic from each PCN-ingress-node, ie not per flow. Similarly, signalling by the PCN-egress-node of PCN-feedback-

information (which is used for flow admission and termination decisions) is at the granularity of the ingress-egress-aggregate. An alternative approach is that the PCN-egress-nodes monitor the PCN-traffic and signal PCN-feedback-information (which is used for flow admission and termination decisions) at the granularity of one (or a few) PCN-marks.

- o The admitted PCN-load is controlled dynamically. Therefore it adapts as the traffic matrix changes, and also if the network topology changes (eg after a link failure). Hence an operator can be less conservative when deploying network capacity, and less accurate in their prediction of the PCN-traffic matrix.
- o The termination mechanism complements admission control. It allows the network to recover from sudden unexpected surges of PCN-traffic on some links, thus restoring QoS to the remaining flows. Such scenarios are expected to be rare but not impossible. They can be caused by large network failures that redirect lots of admitted PCN-traffic to other links, or by malfunction of the measurement-based admission control in the presence of admitted flows that send for a while with an atypically low rate and then increase their rates in a correlated way.
- o The PCN-upper-rate may be set below the maximum rate that PCN-traffic can be transmitted on a link, in order to trigger termination of some PCN-flows before loss (or excessive delay) of

PCN-packets occurs, or to keep the maximum PCN-load on a link below a level configured by the operator.

- o Provisioning of the network is decoupled from the process of adding new customers. By contrast, with the DiffServ architecture [[RFC2475](#)] operators rely on subscription-time Service Level Agreements that statically define the parameters of the traffic that will be accepted from a customer, and so the operator has to run the provisioning process each time a new customer is added to check that the Service Level Agreement can be fulfilled. A PCN-domain doesn't need such traffic conditioning.

Operators of networks will want to use the PCN mechanisms in various arrangements, for instance depending on how they are performing admission control outside the PCN-domain (users after all are

concerned about QoS end-to-end), what their particular goals and assumptions are, and so on. Several deployment models are possible:

- o An operator may choose to deploy either admission control or flow termination or both (see [Section 4.3](#)).
- o IntServ over DiffServ [[RFC2998](#)]. The DiffServ region is PCN-enabled and the PCN-domain is a single RSVP hop, ie only the PCN-boundary-nodes process RSVP messages. Outside the PCN-domain RSVP messages are processed on each hop. The case where RSVP signalling is used end-to-end is described in [[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-cl-architecture](#)]; it would also be possible for the RSVP signalling to be originated and/or terminated by proxies, with application-layer signalling between the end user and the proxy (eg SIP signalling with a home hub).
- o Similar to previous bullet but NSIS signalling is used instead of RSVP.
- o Depending on the deployment scenario, the decision-making functionality (about flow admission and termination) could reside at the PCN-ingress-nodes or PCN-egress-nodes or (see Appendix) at some central control node in the PCN-domain.
- o There are several PCN-domains on the end-to-end path, each operating PCN mechanisms independently.
- o The PCN-domain extends to the end users. The scenario is described in [[I-D.babiarz-pcn-sip-cap](#)]. A variant is that the PCN-domain extends out as far as the LAN edge switch.
- o The operator runs both the access network (not a PCN-domain) and the core network (a PCN-domain); per flow policing is devolved to

the access network and is not done at the PCN-ingress-node. Note: to aid readability, the rest of this draft assumes that policing is done by the PCN-ingress-nodes.

- o Pseudowire: PCN may be used as a congestion avoidance mechanism for edge to edge pseudowire emulations [[I-D.ietf-pwe3-congestion-frmwk](#)].

- o MPLS: [RFC3270] defines how to support the DiffServ architecture in MPLS networks. [RFC5129] describes how to add PCN for admission control of microflows into a set of MPLS aggregates (Multi-protocol label switching). PCN-marking is done in MPLS's EXP field.
- o Similarly, it may be possible to extend PCN into Ethernet networks, where PCN-marking is done in the Ethernet header. NOTE: Specific consideration of this extension is outside the IETF's remit.

From the perspective of the outside world, a PCN-domain essentially looks like a DiffServ domain. PCN-traffic is either transported across it transparently or policed at the PCN-ingress-node (ie dropped or carried at a lower QoS). A couple of differences are that: PCN-traffic has better QoS guarantees than normal DiffServ traffic (because PCN's mechanisms better protect the QoS of admitted flows); and in rare circumstances (failures), on the one hand some PCN-flows may get terminated, but on the other hand other flows will get their QoS restored. Non PCN-traffic is treated transparently, ie the PCN-domain is a normal DiffServ domain.

## 2. Terminology

- o PCN-domain: a PCN-capable domain; a contiguous set of PCN-enabled nodes that perform DiffServ scheduling; the complete set of PCN-nodes whose PCN-marking can in principle influence decisions about flow admission and termination for the PCN-domain, including the PCN-egress-nodes which measure these PCN-marks.
- o PCN-boundary-node: a PCN-node that connects one PCN-domain to a node either in another PCN-domain or in a non PCN-domain.
- o PCN-interior-node: a node in a PCN-domain that is not a PCN-boundary-node.
- o PCN-node: a PCN-boundary-node or a PCN-interior-node

- o PCN-egress-node: a PCN-boundary-node in its role in handling



traffic as it leaves a PCN-domain.

- o PCN-ingress-node: a PCN-boundary-node in its role in handling traffic as it enters a PCN-domain.
- o PCN-traffic: A PCN-domain carries traffic of different DiffServ behaviour aggregates [[RFC2475](#)]. Those using the PCN mechanisms are called PCN-BAs (collectively called PCN-traffic) and the corresponding packets are PCN-packets. The same network may carry traffic using other DiffServ BAs. A PCN-flow is the unit of PCN-traffic that the PCN-boundary-node admits (or terminates); the unit could be a single microflow (as defined in [[RFC2475](#)]) or some identifiable collection of microflows.
- o Ingress-egress-aggregate: The collection of PCN-packets from all PCN-flows that travel in one direction between a specific pair of PCN-boundary-nodes.
- o PCN-lower-rate: a reference rate configured for each link in the PCN-domain, which is lower than the PCN-upper-rate. It is used by a marking behaviour that determines whether a packet should be PCN-marked with a first encoding.
- o PCN-upper-rate: a reference rate configured for each link in the PCN-domain, which is higher than the PCN-lower-rate. It is used by a marking behaviour that determines whether a packet should be PCN-marked with a second encoding.
- o Threshold-marking: a PCN-marking behaviour such that all PCN-traffic is marked if the PCN-traffic exceeds a particular rate (either the PCN-lower-rate or PCN-upper-rate). NOTE: The definition reflects the overall intent rather than its instantaneous behaviour, since the rate measured at a particular moment depends on the behaviour, its implementation and the traffic's variance as well as its rate.
- o Excess-rate-marking: a PCN-marking behaviour such that the amount of PCN-traffic that is PCN-marked is equal to the amount that exceeds a particular rate (either the PCN-lower-rate or PCN-upper-rate). NOTE: The definition reflects the overall intent rather than its instantaneous behaviour, since the rate measured at a particular moment depends on the behaviour, its implementation and the traffic's variance as well as its rate.
- o Pre-congestion: a condition of a link within a PCN-domain in which the PCN-node performs PCN-marking, in order to provide an "early warning" of potential congestion before there is any significant

---

build-up of PCN-packets in the real queue. (Hence, by analogy with ECN we call our mechanism Pre-Congestion Notification.)

- o PCN-marking: the process of setting the header in a PCN-packet based on defined rules, in reaction to pre-congestion.
- o PCN-feedback-information: information signalled by a PCN-egress-node to a PCN-ingress-node or central control node, which is needed for the flow admission and flow termination mechanisms.

### 3. Assumptions and constraints on scope

The scope of PCN is, at least initially (see [Appendix A](#)), restricted by the following assumptions:

1. these components are deployed in a single DiffServ domain, within which all PCN-nodes are PCN-enabled and trust each other for truthful PCN-marking and transport
2. all flows handled by these mechanisms are inelastic and constrained to a known peak rate through policing or shaping
3. the number of PCN-flows across any potential bottleneck link is sufficiently large that stateless, statistical mechanisms can be effective. To put it another way, the aggregate bit rate of PCN-traffic across any potential bottleneck link needs to be sufficiently large relative to the maximum additional bit rate added by one flow. This is the basic assumption of measurement-based admission control.
4. PCN-flows may have different precedence, but the applicability of the PCN mechanisms for emergency use (911, GETS, WPS, MLPP, etc.) is out of scope.

#### 3.1. Assumption 1: Trust and support of PCN - controlled environment

We assume that the PCN-domain is a controlled environment, i.e. all the nodes in a PCN-domain run PCN and trust each other. There are several reasons for proposing this assumption:

- o The PCN-domain has to be encircled by a ring of PCN-boundary-nodes, otherwise traffic could enter a PCN BA without being subject to admission control, which would potentially degrade the QoS of existing PCN-flows.

- o Similarly, a PCN-boundary-node has to trust that all the PCN-nodes mark PCN-traffic consistently. A node not doing PCN-marking

wouldn't be able to alert when it suffered pre-congestion, which potentially would lead to too many PCN-flows being admitted (or too few being terminated). Worse, a rogue node could perform various attacks, as discussed in the Security Considerations section.

One way of assuring the above two points is that the entire PCN-domain is run by a single operator. Another possibility is that there are several operators but they trust each other to a sufficient level, in their handling of PCN-traffic.

Note: All PCN-nodes need to be trustworthy. However if it's known that an interface cannot become pre-congested then it's not strictly necessary for it to be capable of PCN-marking. But this must be known even in unusual circumstances, eg after the failure of some links.

### 3.2. Assumption 2: Real-time applications

We assume that any variation of source bit rate is independent of the level of pre-congestion. We assume that PCN-packets come from real time applications generating inelastic traffic [[Shenker](#)] like voice and video requiring low delay, jitter and packet loss, for example the Controlled Load Service, [[RFC2211](#)], and the Telephony service class, [[RFC4594](#)]. This assumption is to help focus the effort where it looks like PCN would be most useful, ie the sorts of applications where per flow QoS is a known requirement. In other words we focus on PCN providing a benefit to inelastic traffic (PCN may or may not provide a benefit to other types of traffic). For instance, the impact of this assumption would be to guide simulations work.

### 3.3. Assumption 3: Many flows and additional load

We assume that there are many PCN-flows on any bottleneck link in the PCN-domain (or, to put it another way, the aggregate bit rate of PCN-traffic across any potential bottleneck link is sufficiently large relative to the maximum additional bit rate added by one PCN-flow). Measurement-based admission control assumes that the present is a reasonable prediction of the future: the network conditions are

measured at the time of a new flow request, however the actual network performance must be OK during the call some time later. One issue is that if there are only a few variable rate flows, then the aggregate traffic level may vary a lot, perhaps enough to cause some packets to get dropped. If there are many flows then the aggregate traffic level should be statistically smoothed. How many flows is enough depends on a number of things such as the variation in each flow's rate, the total rate of PCN-traffic, and the size of the "safety margin" between the traffic level at which we start

admission-marking and at which packets are dropped or significantly delayed.

We do not make explicit assumptions on how many PCN-flows are in each ingress-egress-aggregate. Performance evaluation work may clarify whether it is necessary to make any additional assumption on aggregation at the ingress-egress-aggregate level.

#### [3.4.](#) Assumption 4: Emergency use out of scope

PCN-flows may have different precedence, but the applicability of the PCN mechanisms for emergency use (911, GETS, WPS, MLPP, etc) is out of scope for consideration by the PCN WG.

#### [3.5.](#) Other assumptions

As a consequence of Assumption 2 above, it is assumed that PCN-marking is being applied to traffic scheduled with the expedited forwarding per-hop behaviour, [[RFC3246](#)], or traffic with similar characteristics.

The following two assumptions apply if the PCN WG decides to encode PCN-marking in the ECN-field.

- o It is assumed that PCN-nodes do not perform ECN, [[RFC3168](#)], on PCN-packets.
- o What to do if a packet that is part of a PCN-flow arrives at a PCN-ingress-node with its CE (Congestion experienced) codepoint set (or if it detects that the ECN-nonce is in use). There are several possibilities (not discussed further in this document) about what the PCN-ingress-node should do:

- \* drop the packet
- \* downgrade the packet to non PCN-BA, eg best effort
- \* tunnel the packet, so that the ECN-marking is carried transparently across the PCN-domain.

#### [4.](#) High-level functional architecture

The high-level approach is to split functionality between:

- o PCN-interior-nodes 'inside' the PCN-domain, which monitor their own state of pre-congestion on each outgoing interface and mark PCN-packets if appropriate. They are not flow-aware, nor aware of

ingress-egress-aggregates. The functionality is also done by PCN-ingress-nodes for their outgoing interfaces (ie those 'inside' the PCN-domain).

- o PCN-boundary-nodes at the edge of the PCN-domain, which control admission of new PCN-flows and termination of existing PCN-flows, based on information from PCN-interior-nodes. This information is in the form of the PCN-marked data packets (which are intercepted by the PCN-egress-nodes) and not signalling messages. Generally PCN-ingress-nodes are flow-aware.

The aim of this split is to keep the bulk of the network simple, scalable and robust, whilst confining policy, application-level and security interactions to the edge of the PCN-domain. For example the lack of flow awareness means that the PCN-interior-nodes don't care about the flow information associated with the PCN-packets that they carry, nor do the PCN-boundary-nodes care about which PCN-interior-nodes its flows traverse.

The objective is to standardise PCN-marking behaviour, but potentially produce more than one (informational) RFC describing how PCN-boundary-nodes react to PCN-marks.

Note: [Section 4](#) and [Section 5](#) talk about PCN functionality being configured on outgoing interfaces of PCN-nodes. Alternatively, PCN

functionality could be configured on the ingress interfaces of PCN-nodes, however a consistent choice must be made across the PCN-domain to ensure that the PCN mechanisms protect all links. This document assumes configuration on the egress interfaces, because in DiffServ networks today DiffServ functionality is usually implemented on egress interfaces.

#### 4.1. Flow admission

At a high level, flow admission control works as follows. In order to generate information about the current state of the PCN-domain, each PCN-node PCN-marks packets if it is "pre-congested". Exactly how a PCN-node decides if it is "pre-congested" (the algorithm) and exactly how packets are "PCN-marked" (the encoding) will be defined in a separate standards-track document, but at a high level it is expected to be as follows:

- o the algorithm: a PCN-node meters the amount of PCN-traffic on each one of its outgoing links. The measurement is made as an aggregate of all PCN-packets, and not per flow. The algorithm has a configured parameter, PCN-lower-rate. As the amount of PCN-traffic exceeds the PCN-lower-rate, then PCN-packets are PCN-marked. See NOTE below for more explanation.

- o the encoding: a PCN-node PCN-marks a PCN-packet (with a first encoding) by setting fields in the header to specific values. It is expected that the ECN and/or DSCP fields will be used.

NOTE: Two main categories of algorithm have been proposed: if the algorithm uses threshold-marking then all PCN-packets are marked if the current rate exceeds the PCN-lower-rate, whereas if the algorithm uses excess-rate-marking the amount marked is equal to the amount in excess of the PCN-lower-rate. However, note that this description reflects the overall intent of the algorithm rather than its instantaneous behaviour, since the rate measured at a particular moment depends on the detailed algorithm, its implementation and the traffic's variance as well as its rate (eg marking may well continue after a recent overload even after the instantaneous rate has dropped).

The PCN-boundary-nodes monitor the PCN-marked packets in order to extract information about the current state of the PCN-domain. Based

on this monitoring, a decision is made about whether to admit a prospective new flow. Exactly how the admission control decision is made will be defined separately (at the moment the intention is that there will be one or more informational-track RFCs), but at a high level two approaches have been proposed to date:

- o the PCN-egress-node measures (possibly as a moving average) the fraction of the PCN-traffic that is PCN-marked. The fraction is measured for a specific ingress-egress-aggregate. If the fraction is below a threshold value then the new flow is admitted.
- o if the PCN-egress-node receives one (or several) PCN-marked packets, then a new flow is blocked, otherwise it is admitted.

Note that the PCN-lower-rate is a parameter that can be configured by the operator. It will be set lower than the traffic rate at which the link becomes congested and the node drops packets.

Note also that the admission control decision is made for a particular pair of PCN-boundary-nodes. So it is quite possible for a new flow to be admitted between one pair of PCN-boundary-nodes, whilst at the same time another admission request is blocked between a different pair of PCN-boundary-nodes.

#### 4.2. Flow termination

At a high level, flow termination control works as follows. Each PCN-node PCN-marks packets in a similar fashion to above, with all proposals using an excess-rate-marking approach ([Section 4.1](#)). An obvious approach is for the algorithm to use a second configured

parameter, PCN-upper-rate, and a second header encoding. However there is also a proposal to use the same rate and the same encoding. Several approaches have been proposed to date about how to convert this information into a flow termination decision; at a high level these are as follows:

- o In one approach the PCN-egress-node measures the rate of unmarked PCN-traffic (ie not PCN-upper-rate-marked), which is the amount of PCN-traffic that can actually be supported. Also the PCN-ingress-node measures the rate of PCN-traffic that is destined for this specific PCN-egress-node, and hence can calculate the excess

amount that should be terminated.

- o Another approach instead measures the rate of PCN-upper-rate-marked traffic and calculates and selects the flows that should be terminated.
- o Another approach terminates any PCN-flow with a PCN-upper-rate-marked packet. Compared with the approaches above, PCN-marking needs to be done at a reduced rate (every "s" bytes of excess traffic) otherwise far too much traffic would be terminated.
- o Another approach uses only one sort of marking, which is based on the PCN-lower-rate, to decide not only whether to admit more PCN-flows but also whether any PCN-flows need to be terminated. It assumes that the ratio of the (implicit) PCN-upper-rate and the PCN-lower-rate is the same on all links. This approach measures the rate of unmarked PCN-traffic at a PCN-egress-node. The PCN-ingress-node uses this measurement to compute the implicit PCN-upper-rate of the bottleneck link. It then measures the rate of PCN-traffic that is destined for this specific PCN-egress-node and hence can calculate the amount that should be terminated.

Since flow termination is designed for "abnormal" circumstances, it is quite likely that some PCN-nodes are congested and hence packets are being dropped and/or significantly queued. The flow termination mechanism must bear this in mind.

Note also that the termination control decision is made for a particular pair of PCN-boundary-nodes. So it is quite possible for PCN-flows to be terminated between one pair of PCN-boundary-nodes, whilst at the same time none are terminated between a different pair of PCN-boundary-nodes.

#### [4.3.](#) Flow admission and flow termination

Although designed to work together, flow admission and flow termination are independent mechanisms, and the use of one does not

require or prevent the use of the other.

For example, an operator could use just admission control, solving heavy congestion (caused by re-routing) by 'just waiting' - as



sessions end, existing microflows naturally depart from the system over time, and the admission control mechanism will prevent admission of new microflows that use the affected links. So the PCN-domain will naturally return to normal operation, but with reduced capacity. The drawback of this approach would be that until PCN-flows naturally depart to relieve the congestion, all PCN-flows as well as lower priority services will be adversely affected. On the other hand, an operator could just rely for admission control on statically provisioned capacity per PCN-ingress-node (regardless of the PCN-egress-node of a flow), as is typical in the hose model of the DiffServ architecture [[RFC2475](#)]. Such traffic conditioning agreements can lead to focused overload: many flows happen to focus on a particular link and then all flows through the congested link fail catastrophically. The flow termination mechanism could then be used to counteract such a problem.

A different possibility is to configure only the PCN-lower-rate and hence only do one type of PCN-marking, but generate admission and flow termination responses from different levels of marking. This is suggested in [[I-D.charny-pcn-single-marking](#)] which gives some of the pros and cons of this approach.

#### [4.4.](#) Information transport

The transport of pre-congestion information from a PCN-node to a PCN-egress-node is through PCN-markings in data packet headers, ie "in-band": no signalling protocol messaging is needed. However, signalling is needed to transport PCN-feedback-information between the PCN-boundary-nodes, for example to convey the fraction of PCN-marked traffic from a PCN-egress-node to the relevant PCN-ingress-node. Exactly what information needs to be transported will be described in the future PCN WG document(s) about the boundary mechanisms. The signalling could be done by an extension of RSVP or NSIS, for instance; protocol work will be done by the relevant WG, but for example [[I-D.lefaucheur-rsvp-ecn](#)] describes the extensions needed for RSVP.

#### [4.5.](#) PCN-traffic

The following are some high-level points about how PCN works:

- o There needs to be a way for a PCN-node to distinguish PCN-traffic from non PCN-traffic. They may be distinguished using the DSCP field and/or ECN field.

- o The PCN mechanisms may be applied to more than one behaviour aggregate (which are distinguished by DSCP).
- o There may be traffic that is more important than PCN, perhaps a particular application or an operator's control messages. A PCN-node may dedicate capacity to such traffic or priority schedule it over PCN. In the latter case its traffic needs to contribute to the PCN meters.
- o There will be traffic less important than PCN. For instance best effort or assured forwarding traffic. It will be scheduled at lower priority than PCN, and use a separate queue or queues. However, a PCN-node should dedicate some capacity to lower priority traffic so that it isn't starved.
- o There may be other traffic with the same priority as PCN-traffic. For instance, Expedited Forwarding sessions that are originated either without capacity admission or with traffic engineering. In [[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-admitted-realtime-dscp](#)] the two traffic classes are called EF and EF-ADMIT. A PCN-node could either use separate queues, or separate policers and a common queue; the draft provides some guidance when each is better, but for instance the latter is preferred when the two traffic classes are carrying the same type of application with the same jitter requirements.

## 5. Detailed Functional architecture

This section is intended to provide a systematic summary of the new functional architecture in the PCN-domain. First it describes functions needed at the three specific types of PCN-node; these are data plane functions and are in addition to their normal router functions. Then it describes further functionality needed for both flow admission control and flow termination; these are signalling and decision-making functions, and there are various possibilities for where the functions are physically located. The section is split into:

1. functions needed at PCN-interior-nodes
2. functions needed at PCN-ingress-nodes
3. functions needed at PCN-egress-nodes
4. other functions needed for flow admission control
5. other functions needed for flow termination control

---

Internet-Draft

Document

February 2008

Note: Probing is covered in [Section 7](#).

The section then discusses some other detailed topics:

1. addressing
2. tunnelling
3. fault handling

#### [5.1](#). PCN-interior-node functions

Each interface of the PCN-domain is configured with the following functionality:

- o Packet classify - decide whether an incoming packet is a PCN-packet or not. Another PCN WG document will specify encoding, using the DSCP and/or ECN fields.
- o PCN-meter - measure the 'amount of PCN-traffic'. The measurement is made as an aggregate of all PCN-packets, and not per flow.
- o PCN-mark - algorithms determine whether to PCN-mark PCN-packets and what packet encoding is used (as specified in another PCN WG document).

The same general approach of metering and PCN-marking is performed for both flow admission control and flow termination, however the algorithms and encoding may be different.

These functions are needed for each interface of the PCN-domain. They are therefore needed on all interfaces of PCN-interior-nodes, and on the interfaces of PCN-boundary-nodes that are internal to the PCN-domain. There may be more than one PCN-meter and marker installed at a given interface, eg one for admission and one for termination.

#### [5.2](#). PCN-ingress-node functions

Each ingress interface of the PCN-domain is configured with the

following functionality:

- o Packet classify - decide whether an incoming packet is part of a previously admitted microflow, by using a filter spec (eg DSCP, source and destination addresses and port numbers)
- o Police - police, by dropping or re-marking with a non-PCN DSCP, any packets received with a DSCP demanding PCN transport that do

not belong to an admitted flow. Similarly, police packets that are part of a previously admitted microflow, to check that the microflow keeps to the agreed rate or flowspec (eg [RFC1633](#) [[RFC1633](#)] and NSIS equivalent). There is a need to be careful to avoid re-ordering traffic.

- o PCN-colour - set the DSCP field or DSCP and ECN fields to the appropriate value(s) for a PCN-packet. The draft about PCN-encoding will discuss further.
- o PCN-meter - make "measurements of PCN-traffic". Some approaches to flow termination require the PCN-ingress-node to measure the (aggregate) rate of PCN-traffic towards a particular PCN-egress-node.

The first two are policing functions, needed to make sure that PCN-packets admitted into the PCN-domain belong to a flow that's been admitted and to ensure that the flow keeps to the flowspec agreed (eg doesn't go at a faster rate and is inelastic traffic). Installing the filter spec will typically be done by the signalling protocol, as will re-installing the filter, for example after a re-route that changes the PCN-ingress-node (see [[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-cl-architecture](#)] for an example using RSVP). PCN-colouring allows the rest of the PCN-domain to recognise PCN-packets.

### [5.3](#). PCN-egress-node functions

Each egress interface of the PCN-domain is configured with the following functionality:

- o Packet classify - determine which PCN-ingress-node a PCN-packet has come from.

- o PCN-meter - "measure PCN-traffic" or "monitor PCN-marks".
- o PCN-colour - for PCN-packets, set the DSCP and ECN fields to the appropriate values for use outside the PCN-domain.

Another PCN WG document, about boundary mechanisms, will describe PCN-metering in more detail. As described in [Section 4.1](#) and [Section 4.2](#), at present there are two alternative proposals: to measure as an aggregate (ie not per flow) all PCN-packets from a particular PCN-ingress-node; or to monitor the PCN-traffic and react to one (or several) PCN-marks. We refer to these approaches as "measuring PCN-traffic" and "monitoring PCN-marks". The PCN-metering functionality also depends on whether the measurement is targeted at admission control or flow termination. It also depends on what encoding and PCN-marking algorithms are specified by the PCN WG.

#### [5.4.](#) Other admission control functions

As well as the functions covered above (Sections [5.1](#), [5.2](#), [5.3](#)), other specific admission control functions can be performed at a PCN-boundary-node (PCN-ingress-node or PCN-egress-node) or at a centralised node, but not at normal PCN-interior-nodes. The functions are:

- o Make decision about admission - based on the output of the PCN-egress-node's PCN-meter function. In the case where it "measures PCN-traffic", the measured traffic on the ingress-egress-aggregate is compared with some reference level. In the case where it "monitors PCN-marks", then the decision is based on whether one (or several) packets is (are) PCN-marked or not. In either case, the admission decision also takes account of policy and application layer requirements.
- o Communicate decision about admission - signal the decision to the node making the admission control request (which may be outside the PCN-domain), and to the policer (PCN-ingress-node function) for enforcement of the decision.

There are various possibilities for how the functionality can be distributed (we assume the operator would configure which is used):

- o The decision is made at the PCN-egress-node and signalled to the

## PCN-ingress-node

- o The decision is made at the PCN-ingress-node, which requires that the PCN-egress-node signals PCN-feedback-information to the PCN-ingress-node. For example, in the case where the PCN-meter function is to "measure PCN-traffic" it could signal the fraction of PCN-traffic that is PCN-marked.
- o The decision is made at a centralised node (see Appendix).

The decision needs to be passed to the application layer so that it can take the appropriate action.

### [5.5.](#) Other flow termination functions

Specific termination control functions can be performed at a PCN-boundary-node (PCN-ingress-node or PCN-egress-node) or at a centralised node, but not at normal PCN-interior-nodes. There are various possibilities for how the functionality can be distributed, similar to those discussed above in the Admission control section; the flow termination decision could be made at the PCN-ingress-node, the PCN-egress-node or at some centralised node. The functions are:

- o PCN-meter at PCN-egress-node - similarly to flow admission, there are two proposals: to "measure PCN-traffic" on the ingress-egress-aggregate, and to "monitor PCN-marks" and react to one (or several) PCN-marks.
- o (if required) PCN-meter at PCN-ingress-node - make "measurements of PCN-traffic" being sent towards a particular PCN-egress-node; again, this is done for the ingress-egress-aggregate and not per flow.
- o (if required) Communicate PCN-feedback-information to the node that makes the flow termination decision. For example, as in [[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-cl-architecture](#)], communicate the PCN-egress-node's measurements to the PCN-ingress-node.
- o Make decision about flow termination - use the information from the PCN-meter(s) to decide which PCN-flow or PCN-flows to terminate. The decision takes account of policy and application layer requirements.

- o Communicate decision about flow termination - signal the decision to the node that is able to terminate the flow (which may be outside the PCN-domain), and to the policer (PCN-ingress-node function) for enforcement of the decision.

## [5.6.](#) Addressing

PCN-nodes may need to know the address of other PCN-nodes. Note: in all cases PCN-interior-nodes don't need to know the address of any other PCN-nodes (except as normal their next hop neighbours, for routing purposes).

The PCN-egress-node needs to know the address of the PCN-ingress-node associated with a flow, at a minimum so that the PCN-ingress-node can be informed to enforce the admission decision (and any flow termination decision) through policing. There are various possibilities for how the PCN-egress-node can do this, ie associate the received packet to the correct ingress-egress-aggregate. It is not the intention of this document to mandate a particular mechanism.

- o The addressing information can be gathered from signalling. For example, regular processing of an RSVP Path message, as the PCN-ingress-node is the previous RSVP hop (PHOP) ([\[I-D.lefaucheur-rsvp-ecn\]](#)).
- o Use a probe packet that includes as payload the address of the PCN-ingress-node.

- o Always tunnel PCN-traffic across the PCN-domain. Then the PCN-ingress-node's address is simply the source address of the outer packet header. The PCN-ingress-node needs to learn the address of the PCN-egress-node, either by manual configuration or by one of the automated tunnel endpoint discovery mechanisms (such as signalling or probing over the data route, interrogating routing or using a centralised broker).

## [5.7.](#) Tunnelling

Tunnels may originate and/or terminate within a PCN-domain. It is important that the PCN-marking of any packet can potentially

influence PCN's flow admission control and termination - it shouldn't matter whether the packet happens to be tunneled at the PCN-node that PCN-marks the packet, or indeed whether it's decapsulated or encapsulated by a subsequent PCN-node. This suggests that the "uniform conceptual model" described in [[RFC2983](#)] should be re-applied in the PCN context. In line with this and the approach of [[RFC4303](#)] and [[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-ecn-tunnel](#)], the following rule is applied if encapsulation is done within the PCN-domain:

- o any PCN-marking is copied into the outer header

Similarly, in line with the "uniform conceptual model" of [[RFC2983](#)] and the "full-functionality option" of [[RFC3168](#)], the following rule is applied if decapsulation is done within the PCN-domain:

- o if the outer header's marking state is more severe then it is copied onto the inner header
- o Note: the order of increasing severity is: unmarked; PCN-marking with first encoding (ie associated with the PCN-lower-rate); PCN-marking with second encoding (ie associated with the PCN-upper-rate)

An operator may wish to tunnel PCN-traffic from PCN-ingress-nodes to PCN-egress-nodes. The PCN-marks shouldn't be visible outside the PCN-domain, which can be achieved by doing the PCN-colour function ([Section 5.3](#)) after all the other (PCN and tunnelling) functions. The potential reasons for doing such tunnelling are: the PCN-egress-node then automatically knows the address of the relevant PCN-ingress-node for a flow; even if ECMP is running, all PCN-packets on a particular ingress-egress-aggregate follow the same path. But it also has drawbacks, for example the additional overhead in terms of bandwidth and processing, and the cost of setting up a mesh of tunnels between PCN-boundary-nodes (there is an  $N^2$  scaling issue).

Potential issues arise for a "partially PCN-capable tunnel", ie where

only one tunnel endpoint is in the PCN domain:

1. The tunnel starts outside a PCN-domain and finishes inside it. If the packet arrives at the tunnel ingress with the same encoding as used within the PCN-domain to indicate PCN-marking,



then this could lead the PCN-egress-node to falsely measure pre-congestion.

2. The tunnel starts inside a PCN-domain and finishes outside it. If the packet arrives at the tunnel ingress already PCN-marked, then it will still have the same encoding when it's decapsulated which could potentially confuse nodes beyond the tunnel egress.

In line with the solution for partially capable DiffServ tunnels in [[RFC2983](#)], the following rules are applied:

- o For case (1), the tunnel egress node clears any PCN-marking on the inner header. This rule is applied before the 'copy on decapsulation' rule above.
- o For case (2), the tunnel ingress node clears any PCN-marking on the inner header. This rule is applied after the 'copy on encapsulation' rule above.

Note that the above implies that one has to know, or figure out, the characteristics of the other end of the tunnel as part of setting it up.

#### [5.8.](#) Fault handling

If a PCN-interior-node fails (or one of its links), then lower layer protection mechanisms or the regular IP routing protocol will eventually re-route round it. If the new route can carry all the admitted traffic, flows will gracefully continue. If instead this causes early warning of pre-congestion on the new route, then admission control based on pre-congestion notification will ensure new flows will not be admitted until enough existing flows have departed. Re-routing may result in heavy (pre-)congestion, when the flow termination mechanism will kick in.

If a PCN-boundary-node fails then we would like the regular QoS signalling protocol to take care of things. As an example [[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-cl-architecture](#)] considers what happens if RSVP is the QoS signalling protocol.

## 6. Design goals and challenges

Prior work on PCN and similar mechanisms has thrown up a number of considerations about PCN's design goals (things PCN should be good at) and some issues that have been hard to solve in a fully satisfactory manner. Taken as a whole it represents a list of trade-offs (it's unlikely that they can all be 100% achieved) and perhaps as evaluation criteria to help an operator (or the IETF) decide between options.

The following are key design goals for PCN (based on [\[I-D.chan-pcn-problem-statement\]](#)):

- o The PCN-enabled packet forwarding network should be simple, scalable and robust
- o Compatibility with other traffic (ie a proposed solution should work well when non-PCN traffic is also present in the network)
- o Support of different types of real-time traffic (eg should work well with CBR and VBR voice and video sources treated together)
- o Reaction time of the mechanisms should be commensurate with the desired application-level requirements (eg a termination mechanism needs to terminate flows before significant QoS issues are experienced by real-time traffic, and before most users hang up).
- o Compatibility with different precedence levels of real-time applications (e.g. preferential treatment of higher precedence calls over lower precedence calls, [\[ITU-MLPP\]](#)).

The following are open issues. They are mainly taken from [\[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-cl-architecture\]](#) which also describes some possible solutions. Note that some may be considered unimportant in general or in specific deployment scenarios or by some operators.

NOTE: Potential solutions are out of scope for this document.

- o ECMP (Equal Cost Multi-Path) Routing: The level of pre-congestion is measured on a specific ingress-egress-aggregate. However, if the PCN-domain runs ECMP, then traffic on this ingress-egress-aggregate may follow several different paths - some of the paths could be pre-congested whilst others are not. There are three potential problems:
  1. over-admission: a new flow is admitted (because the pre-congestion level measured by the PCN-egress-node is sufficiently diluted by unmarked packets from non-congested

Internet-Draft

Document

February 2008

paths that a new flow is admitted), but its packets travel through a pre-congested PCN-node

2. **under-admission:** a new flow is blocked (because the pre-congestion level measured by the PCN-egress-node is sufficiently increased by PCN-marked packets from pre-congested paths that a new flow is blocked), but its packets travel along an uncongested path
  3. **ineffective termination:** flows are terminated, however their path doesn't travel through the (pre-)congested router(s). Since flow termination is a 'last resort' that protects the network should over-admission occur, this problem is probably more important to solve than the other two.
- o **ECMP and signalling:** It is possible that, in a PCN-domain running ECMP, the signalling packets (eg RSVP, NSIS) follow a different path than the data packets, which could matter if the signalling packets are used as probes. Whether this is an issue depends on which fields the ECMP algorithm uses; if the ECMP algorithm is restricted to the source and destination IP addresses, then it won't be.
  - o **Tunnelling:** There are scenarios where tunnelling makes it hard to determine the path in the PCN-domain. The problem, its impact and the potential solutions are similar to those for ECMP.
  - o **Scenarios with only one tunnel endpoint in the PCN domain** may make it harder for the PCN-egress-node to gather from the signalling messages (eg RSVP, NSIS) the identity of the PCN-ingress-node.
  - o **Bi-Directional Sessions:** Many applications have bi-directional sessions - hence there are two flows that should be admitted (or terminated) as a pair - for instance a bi-directional voice call only makes sense if flows in both directions are admitted. However, PCN's mechanisms concern admission and termination of a single flow, and coordination of the decision for both flows is a matter for the signalling protocol and out of scope of PCN. One possible example would use SIP pre-conditions; there are others.
  - o **Global Coordination:** PCN makes its admission decision based on PCN-markings on a particular ingress-egress-aggregate. Decisions

about flows through a different ingress-egress-aggregate are made independently. However, one can imagine network topologies and traffic matrices where, from a global perspective, it would be better to make a coordinated decision across all the ingress-egress-aggregates for the whole PCN-domain. For example, to block (or even terminate) flows on one ingress-egress-aggregate so that

more important flows through a different ingress-egress-aggregate could be admitted. The problem may well be second order.

- o Aggregate Traffic Characteristics: Even when the number of flows is stable, the traffic level through the PCN-domain will vary because the sources vary their traffic rates. PCN works best when there's not too much variability in the total traffic level at a PCN-node's interface (ie in the aggregate traffic from all sources). Too much variation means that a node may (at one moment) not be doing any PCN-marking and then (at another moment) drop packets because it's overloaded. This makes it hard to tune the admission control scheme to stop admitting new flows at the right time. Therefore the problem is more likely with fewer, burstier flows.
- o Flash crowds and Speed of Reaction: PCN is a measurement-based mechanism and so there is an inherent delay between packet marking by PCN-interior-nodes and any admission control reaction at PCN-boundary-nodes. For example, potentially if a big burst of admission requests occurs in a very short space of time (eg prompted by a televote), they could all get admitted before enough PCN-marks are seen to block new flows. In other words, any additional load offered within the reaction time of the mechanism mustn't move the PCN-domain directly from no congestion to overload. This 'vulnerability period' may impact at the signalling level, for instance QoS requests should be rate limited to bound the number of requests able to arrive within the vulnerability period.
- o Silent at start: after a successful admission request the source may wait some time before sending data (eg waiting for the called party to answer). Then the risk is that, in some circumstances, PCN's measurements underestimate what the pre-congestion level will be when the source does start sending data.

- o Compatibility of PCN-encoding with ECN-encoding. This issue will be considered further in the PCN WG Milestone 'Survey of encoding choices'.

## [7.](#) Probing

### [7.1.](#) Introduction

Probing is an optional mechanism to assist admission control.

PCN's admission control, as described so far, is essentially a reactive mechanism where the PCN-egress-node monitors the pre-

congestion level for traffic from each PCN-ingress-node; if the level rises then it blocks new flows on that ingress-egress-aggregate. However, it's possible that an ingress-egress-aggregate carries no traffic, and so the PCN-egress-node can't make an admission decision using the usual method described earlier.

One approach is to be "optimistic" and simply admit the new flow. However it's possible to envisage a scenario where the traffic levels on other ingress-egress-aggregates are already so high that they're blocking new PCN-flows, and admitting a new flow onto this 'empty' ingress-egress-aggregate adds extra traffic onto the link that's already pre-congested - which may 'tip the balance' so that PCN's flow termination mechanism is activated or some packets are dropped. This risk could be lessened by configuring on each link sufficient 'safety margin' above the PCN-lower-rate.

An alternative approach is to make PCN a more proactive mechanism. The PCN-ingress-node explicitly determines, before admitting the prospective new flow, whether the ingress-egress-aggregate can support it. This can be seen as a "pessimistic" approach, in contrast to the "optimism" of the approach above. It involves probing: a PCN-ingress-node generates and sends probe packets in order to test the pre-congestion level that the flow would experience.

One possibility is that a probe packet is just a dummy data packet, generated by the PCN-ingress-node and addressed to the PCN-egress-node. Another possibility is that a probe packet is a signalling

packet that is anyway travelling from the PCN-ingress-node to the PCN-egress-node (eg an RSVP PATH message travelling from source to destination).

## 7.2. Probing functions

The probing functions are:

- o Make decision that probing is needed. As described above, this is when the ingress-egress-aggregate (or the ECMP path - [Section 6](#)) carries no PCN-traffic. An alternative is always to probe, ie probe before admitting every PCN-flow.
- o (if required) Communicate the request that probing is needed - the PCN-egress-node signals to the PCN-ingress-node that probing is needed
- o (if required) Generate probe traffic - the PCN-ingress-node generates the probe traffic. The appropriate number (or rate) of probe packets will depend on the PCN-marking algorithm; for

example an excess-rate-marking algorithm generates fewer PCN-marks than a threshold-marking algorithm, and so will need more probe packets.

- o Forward probe packets - as far as PCN-interior-nodes are concerned, probe packets must be handled the same as (ordinary data) PCN-packets, in terms of routing, scheduling and PCN-marking.
- o Consume probe packets - the PCN-egress-node consumes probe packets to ensure that they don't travel beyond the PCN-domain.

## 7.3. Discussion of rationale for probing, its downsides and open issues

It is an unresolved question whether probing is really needed, but three viewpoints have been put forward as to why it is useful. The first is perhaps the most obvious: there is no PCN-traffic on the ingress-egress-aggregate. The second assumes that multipath routing ECMP is running in the PCN-domain. The third viewpoint is that admission control is always done by probing. We now consider each in turn.

The first viewpoint assumes the following:

- o There is no PCN-traffic on the ingress-egress-aggregate (so a normal admission decision cannot be made).
- o Simply admitting the new flow has a significant risk of leading to overload: packets dropped or flows terminated.

On the former bullet, [[PCN-email-traffic-empty-aggregates](#)] suggests that, during the future busy hour of a national network with about 100 PCN-boundary-nodes, there are likely to be significant numbers of aggregates with very few flows under nearly all circumstances.

The latter bullet could occur if a new flow starts on many of the empty ingress-egress-aggregates and causes overload on a link in the PCN-domain. To be a problem this would probably have to happen in a short time period (flash crowd) because, after the reaction time of the system, other (non-empty) ingress-egress-aggregates that pass through the link will measure pre-congestion and so block new flows, and also flows naturally end anyway.

The downsides of probing for this viewpoint are:

- o Probing adds delay to the admission control process.

- o Sufficient probing traffic has to be generated to test the pre-congestion level of the ingress-egress-aggregate. But the probing traffic itself may cause pre-congestion, causing other PCN-flows to be blocked or even terminated - and in the flash crowd scenario there will be probing on many ingress-egress-aggregates.

The open issues associated with this viewpoint include:

- o What rate and pattern of probe packets does the PCN-ingress-node need to generate, so that there's enough traffic to make the admission decision?
- o What difficulty does the delay (whilst probing is done) cause applications, eg packets might be dropped?

- o Are there other ways of dealing with the flash crowd scenario? For instance limit the rate at which new flows are admitted; or perhaps for a PCN-egress-node to block new flows on its empty ingress-egress-aggregates when its non-empty ones are pre-congested.

The second viewpoint applies in the case where there is multipath routing (ECMP) in the PCN-domain. Note that ECMP is often used on core networks. There are two possibilities:

(1) If admission control is based on measurements of the ingress-egress-aggregate, then the viewpoint that probing is useful assumes:

- o there's a significant chance that the traffic is unevenly balanced across the ECMP paths, and hence there's a significant risk of admitting a flow that should be blocked (because it follows an ECMP path that is pre-congested) or blocking a flow that should be admitted.
- o Note: [[PCN-email-ECMP](#)] suggests unbalanced traffic is quite possible, even with quite a large number of flows on a PCN-link (eg 1000) when Assumption 3 (aggregation) is likely to be satisfied.

(2) If admission control is based on measurements of pre-congestion on specific ECMP paths, then the viewpoint that probing is useful assumes:

- o There is no PCN-traffic on the ECMP path on which to base an admission decision.
- o Simply admitting the new flow has a significant risk of leading to overload.

- o The PCN-egress-node can match a packet to an ECMP path.
- o Note: This is similar to the first viewpoint and so similarly could occur in a flash crowd if a new flow starts more-or-less simultaneously on many of the empty ECMP paths. Because there are several (sometimes many) ECMP paths between each pair of PCN-boundary-nodes, it's presumably more likely that an ECMP path is



'empty' than an ingress-egress-aggregate. To constrain the number of ECMP paths, a few tunnels could be set-up between each pair of PCN-boundary-nodes. Tunnelling also solves the third bullet (which is otherwise hard because an ECMP routing decision is made independently on each node).

The downsides of probing for this viewpoint are:

- o Probing adds delay to the admission control process.
- o Sufficient probing traffic has to be generated to test the pre-congestion level of the ECMP path. But there's the risk that the probing traffic itself may cause pre-congestion, causing other PCN-flows to be blocked or even terminated.
- o The PCN-egress-node needs to consume the probe packets to ensure they don't travel beyond the PCN-domain (eg they might confuse the destination end node). Hence somehow the PCN-egress-node has to be able to disambiguate a probe packet from a data packet, via the characteristic setting of particular bit(s) in the packet's header or body - but these bit(s) mustn't be used by any PCN-interior-node's ECMP algorithm. In the general case this isn't possible, but it should be OK for a typical ECMP algorithm which examines: the source and destination IP addresses and port numbers, the protocol ID and the DSCP.

The third viewpoint assumes the following:

- o Every admission control decision involves probing, using the signalling set-up message as the probe packet (eg RSVP PATH).
- o The PCN-marking behaviour is such that every packet is PCN-marked if the flow should be blocked, hence only a single probing packet is needed.

This viewpoint [I-D.[draft-babiarz-pcn-3sm](#)] has in particular been suggested for the scenario where the PCN-domain reaches out towards the end terminals (note that it's assumed the trust and aggregation assumptions still hold), although it has also been suggested for other scenarios.

## 8. Operations and Management

This Section considers operations and management issues, under the FCAPS headings: OAM of Faults, Configuration, Accounting, Performance and Security. Provisioning is discussed with performance.

### 8.1. Configuration OAM

This architecture document predates the detailed standards actions of the PCN WG. Here we assume that only interoperable PCN-marking behaviours will be standardised, otherwise we would have to consider how to avoid interactions between non-interoperable marking behaviours. However, more diversity in PCN-boundary-node behaviours is expected, in order to interface with diverse industry architectures. It may be possible to have different PCN-boundary-node behaviours for different ingress-egress-aggregates within the same PCN-domain.

PCN functionality is configured on either the egress or the ingress interfaces of PCN-nodes. A consistent choice must be made across the PCN-domain to ensure that the PCN mechanisms protect all links.

PCN configuration control variables fall into the following categories:

- o system options (enabling or disabling behaviours)
- o parameters (setting levels, addresses etc)

One possibility is that all configurable variables sit within an SNMP management framework [[RFC3411](#)], being structured within a defined management information base (MIB) on each node, and being remotely readable and settable via a suitably secure management protocol (SNMPv3).

Some configuration options and parameters have to be set once to 'globally' control the whole PCN-domain. Where possible, these are identified below. This may affect operational complexity and the chances of interoperability problems between kit from different vendors.

It may be possible for an operator to configure some PCN-interior-nodes so they don't run the PCN mechanisms, if it knows that these links will never become (pre-)congested.

Internet-Draft

Document

February 2008

### [8.1.1.](#) System options

On PCN-interior-nodes there will be very few system options:

- o Whether two PCN-markings (based on the PCN-lower-rate and PCN-upper-rate) are enabled or only one (see [Section 4.3](#)). Typically all nodes throughout a PCN-domain will be configured the same in this respect. However, exceptions could be made. For example, if most PCN-nodes used both markings, but some legacy hardware was incapable of running two algorithms, an operator might be willing to configure these legacy nodes solely for PCN-marking based on the PCN-upper-rate to enable flow termination as a back-stop. It would be sensible to place such nodes where they could be provisioned with a greater leeway over expected traffic levels.
- o which marking algorithm to use, if an equipment vendor provides a choice

PCN-boundary-nodes (ingress and egress) will have more system options:

- o Which of admission and flow termination are enabled. If any PCN-interior-node is configured to generate a marking, all PCN-boundary-nodes must be able to handle that marking. Therefore all PCN-boundary-nodes must be configured the same in this respect.
- o Where flow admission and termination decisions are made: at the PCN-ingress-node, PCN-egress-node or at a centralised node (see Sections [5.4](#) and [5.5](#)). Theoretically, this configuration choice could be negotiated for each pair of PCN-boundary-nodes, but we cannot imagine why such complexity would be required, except perhaps in future inter-domain scenarios.

PCN-egress-nodes will have further system options:

- o How the mapping should be established between each packet and its aggregate, eg by MPLS label, by IP packet filterspec; and how to take account of ECMP.
- o If an equipment vendor provides a choice, there may be options to select which smoothing algorithm to use for measurements.

### [8.1.2.](#) Parameters

Like any DiffServ domain, every node within a PCN-domain will need to be configured with the DSCP(s) used to identify PCN-packets. On each interior link the main configuration parameters are the PCN-lower-rate and PCN-upper-rate. A larger PCN-lower-rate enables more PCN-

traffic to be admitted on a link, hence improving capacity utilisation. A PCN-upper-rate set further above the PCN-lower-rate allows greater increases in traffic (whether due to natural fluctuations or some unexpected event) before any flows are terminated, ie minimises the chances of unnecessarily triggering the termination mechanism. For instance an operator may want to design their network so that it can cope with a failure of any single PCN-node without terminating any flows.

Setting these rates on first deployment of PCN will be very similar to the traditional process for sizing an admission controlled network, depending on: the operator's requirements for minimising flow blocking (grade of service), the expected PCN traffic load on each link and its statistical characteristics (the traffic matrix), contingency for re-routing the PCN traffic matrix in the event of single or multiple failures and the expected load from other classes relative to link capacities [[Menth](#)]. But once a domain is up and running, a PCN design goal is to be able to determine growth in these configured rates much more simply, by monitoring PCN-marking rates from actual rather than expected traffic (see [Section 8.2](#) on Performance & Provisioning).

Operators may also wish to configure a rate greater than the PCN-upper-rate that is the absolute maximum rate that a link allows for PCN-traffic. This may simply be the physical link rate, but some operators may wish to configure a logical limit to prevent starvation of other traffic classes during any brief period after PCN-traffic exceeds the PCN-upper-rate but before flow termination brings it back below this rate.

Specific marking algorithms will also depend on further configuration parameters. For instance, threshold-marking will require a threshold queue depth and excess-rate-marking may require a scaling parameter. It will be preferable for each marking algorithm to have rules to set defaults for these parameters relative to the reference marking rate, but then allow operators to change them, for instance if average

traffic characteristics change over time. The PCN-egress-node may allow configuration of the following:

- o how it smoothes metering of PCN-markings (eg EWMA parameters)

Whichever node makes admission and flow termination decisions will contain algorithms for converting PCN-marking levels into admission or flow termination decisions. These will also require configurable parameters, for instance:

- o Any admission control algorithm will at least require a marking threshold setting above which it denies admission to new flows;
- o flow termination algorithms will probably require a parameter to delay termination of any flows until it is more certain that an anomalous event is not transient;
- o a parameter to control the trade-off between how quickly excess flows are terminated and over-termination.

One particular proposal, [[I-D.charny-pcn-single-marking](#)] would require a global parameter to be defined on all PCN-nodes, but only needs the PCN-lower-rate to be configured on each link. The global parameter is a scaling factor between admission and termination, for example the amount by which the PCN-upper-rate is implicitly assumed to be above the PCN-lower-rate. [[I-D.charny-pcn-single-marking](#)] discusses in full the impact of this particular proposal on the operation of PCN.

## [8.2.](#) Performance & Provisioning OAM

Monitoring of performance factors measurable from \*outside\* the PCN domain will be no different with PCN than with any other packet-based flow admission control system, both at the flow level (blocking probability etc) and the packet level (jitter [[RFC3393](#)], [[Y.1541](#)], loss rate [[RFC4656](#)], mean opinion score [[P.800](#)], etc). The difference is that PCN is intentionally designed to indicate \*internally\* which exact resource(s) are the cause of performance problems and by how much.

Even better, PCN indicates which resources will probably cause problems if they are not upgraded soon. This can be achieved by the management system monitoring the total amount (in bytes) of PCN-marking generated by each queue over a period. Given possible long provisioning lead times, pre-congestion volume is the best metric to reveal whether sufficient persistent demand has mounted up to warrant an upgrade. Because, even before utilisation becomes problematic, the statistical variability of traffic will cause occasional bursts of pre-congestion. This 'early warning system' decouples the process of adding customers from the provisioning process. This should cut the time to add a customer when compared against admission control provided over native DiffServ [[RFC2998](#)], because it saves having to re-run the capacity planning process before adding each customer.

Alternatively, before triggering an upgrade, the long term pre-congestion volume on each link can be used to balance traffic load across the PCN-domain by adjusting the link weights of the routing system. When an upgrade to a link's configured PCN-rates is

required, it may also be necessary to upgrade the physical capacity available to other classes. But usually there will be sufficient physical capacity for the upgrade to go ahead as a simple configuration change. Alternatively, [[Songhurst](#)] has proposed an adaptive rather than preconfigured system, where the configured PCN-lower-rate is replaced with a high and low water mark and the marking algorithm automatically optimises how physical capacity is shared using the relative loads from PCN and other traffic classes.

All the above processes require just three extra counters associated with each PCN queue: PCN-markings associated with the PCN-lower-rate and PCN-upper-rate, and drop. Every time a PCN packet is marked or dropped its size in bytes should be added to the appropriate counter. Then the management system can read the counters at any time and subtract a previous reading to establish the incremental volume of each type of (pre-)congestion. Readings should be taken frequently, so that anomalous events (eg re-routes) can be separated from regular fluctuating demand if required.

### [8.3.](#) Accounting OAM

Accounting is only done at trust boundaries so it is out of scope of

the initial Charter of the PCN WG which is confined to intra-domain issues. Use of PCN internal to a domain makes no difference to the flow signalling events crossing trust boundaries outside the PCN-domain, which are typically used for accounting.

#### [8.4.](#) Fault OAM

Fault OAM is about preventing faults, telling the management system (or manual operator) that the system has recovered (or not) from a failure, and about maintaining information to aid fault diagnosis.

Admission blocking and particularly flow termination mechanisms should rarely be needed in practice. It would be unfortunate if they didn't work after an option had been accidentally disabled. Therefore it will be necessary to regularly test that the live system works as intended (devising a meaningful test is left as an exercise for the operator).

[Section 5.9](#) describes how the PCN architecture has been designed to ensure admitted flows continue gracefully after recovering automatically from link or node failures. The need to record and monitor re-routing events affecting signalling is unchanged by the addition of PCN to a DiffServ domain. Similarly, re-routing events within the PCN-domain will be recorded and monitored just as they would be without PCN.

PCN-marking does make it possible to record 'near-misses'. For instance, at the PCN-egress-node a 'reporting threshold' could be set to monitor how often - and for how long - the system comes close to triggering flow blocking without actually doing so. Similarly, bursts of flow termination marking could be recorded even if they are not sufficiently sustained to trigger flow termination. Such statistics could be correlated with per-queue counts of marking volume ([Section 8.2](#)) to upgrade resources in danger of causing service degradation, or to trigger manual tracing of intermittent incipient errors that would otherwise have gone unnoticed.

Finally, of course, many faults are caused by failings in the management process ('human error'): a wrongly configured address in a node, a wrong address given in a signalling protocol, a wrongly configured parameter in a queueing algorithm, a node set into a

different mode from other nodes, and so on. Generally, a clean design with few configurable options ensures this class of faults can be traced more easily and prevented more often. Sound management practice at run-time also helps. For instance: a management system should be used that constrains configuration changes within system rules (eg preventing an option setting inconsistent with other nodes); configuration options should also be recorded in an offline database; and regular automatic consistency checks between live systems and the database. PCN adds nothing specific to this class of problems. By the time standards are in place, we expect that the PCN WG will have ruthlessly removed gratuitous configuration choices. However, at the time of writing, the WG is yet to choose between multiple competing proposals, so the range of possible options in [Section 8.1](#) does seem rather wide compared to the original near-zero configuration intent of the architecture.

### [8.5](#). Security OAM

Security OAM is about using secure operational practices as well as being able to track security breaches or near-misses at run-time. PCN adds few specifics to the general good practice required in this field [[RFC4778](#)], other than those below. The correct functions of the system should be monitored ([Section 8.2](#)) in multiple independent ways and correlated to detect possible security breaches. Persistent (pre-)congestion marking should raise an alarm (both on the node doing the marking and on the PCN-egress-node metering it). Similarly, persistently poor external QoS metrics such as jitter or MOS should raise an alarm. The following are examples of symptoms that may be the result of innocent faults, rather than attacks, but until diagnosed they should be logged and trigger a security alarm:

- o Anomalous patterns of non-conforming incoming signals and packets rejected at the PCN-ingress-nodes (eg packets already marked PCN-capable, or traffic persistently starving token bucket policers).
- o PCN-capable packets arriving at a PCN-egress-node with no associated state for mapping them to a valid ingress-egress-aggregate.



- o A PCN-ingress-node receiving feedback signals about the pre-congestion level on a non-existent aggregate, or that are inconsistent with other signals (eg unexpected sequence numbers, inconsistent addressing, conflicting reports of the pre-congestion level, etc).
- o Pre-congestion marking arriving at an PCN-egress-node with (pre-)congestion markings focused on particular flows, rather than randomly distributed throughout the aggregate.

## 9. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA.

## 10. Security considerations

Security considerations essentially come from the Trust Assumption ([Section 3.1](#)), ie that all PCN-nodes are PCN-enabled and trust each other for truthful PCN-marking and transport. PCN splits functionality between PCN-interior-nodes and PCN-boundary-nodes, and the security considerations are somewhat different for each, mainly because PCN-boundary-nodes are flow-aware and PCN-interior-nodes are not.

- o because the PCN-boundary-nodes are flow-aware, they are trusted to use that awareness correctly. The degree of trust required depends on the kinds of decisions they have to make and the kinds of information they need to make them. For example when the PCN-boundary-node needs to know the contents of the sessions for making the admission and termination decisions, or when the contents are highly classified, then the security requirements for the PCN-boundary-nodes involved will also need to be high.
- o the PCN-ingress-nodes police packets to ensure a PCN-flow sticks within its agreed limit, and to ensure that only PCN-flows which have been admitted contribute PCN-traffic into the PCN-domain. The policer must drop (or perhaps re-mark to a different DSCP) any PCN-packets received that are outside this remit. This is similar

to the existing IntServ behaviour. Between them the PCN-boundary-

nodes must encircle the PCN-domain, otherwise PCN-packets could enter the PCN-domain without being subject to admission control, which would potentially destroy the QoS of existing flows.

- o PCN-interior-nodes aren't flow-aware. This prevents some security attacks where an attacker targets specific flows in the data plane - for instance for DoS or eavesdropping.
- o PCN-marking by the PCN-interior-nodes along the packet forwarding path needs to be trusted, because the PCN-boundary-nodes rely on this information. For instance a rogue PCN-interior-node could PCN-mark all packets so that no flows were admitted. Another possibility is that it doesn't PCN-mark any packets, even when it's pre-congested. More subtly, the rogue PCN-interior-node could perform these attacks selectively on particular flows, or it could PCN-mark the correct fraction overall, but carefully choose which flows it marked.
- o the PCN-boundary-nodes should be able to deal with DoS attacks and state exhaustion attacks based on fast changes in per flow signalling.
- o the signalling between the PCN-boundary-nodes (and possibly a central control node) must be protected from attacks. For example the recipient needs to validate that the message is indeed from the node that claims to have sent it. Possible measures include digest authentication and protection against replay and man-in-the-middle attacks. For the specific protocol RSVP, hop-by-hop authentication is in [[RFC2747](#)], and [[I-D.behringer-tsvwg-rsvp-security-groupkeying](#)] may also be useful; for a generic signalling protocol the PCN WG document on "Requirements for signalling" will describe the requirements in more detail.

Operational security advice is given in [Section 8.5](#).

## 11. Conclusions

The document describes a general architecture for flow admission and termination based on pre-congestion information in order to protect the quality of service of established inelastic flows within a single DiffServ domain. The main topic is the functional architecture (first covered at a high level and then at a greater level of detail). It also mentions other topics like the assumptions and open issues.

## 12. Acknowledgements

This document is a revised version of [[I-D.eardley-pcn-architecture](#)]. Its authors were: P. Eardley, J. Babiarz, K. Chan, A. Charny, R. Geib, G. Karagiannis, M. Menth, T. Tsou. They are therefore contributors to this document.

Thanks to those who've made comments on [[I-D.eardley-pcn-architecture](#)] and on earlier versions of this draft: Lachlan Andrew, Joe Babiarz, Fred Baker, David Black, Steven Blake, Bob Briscoe, Ken Carlberg, Anna Charny, Joachim Charzinski, Andras Csaszar, Lars Eggert, Ruediger Geib, Robert Hancock, Ingemar Johansson, Georgios Karagiannis, Michael Menth, Tom Taylor, Hannes Tschofenig, Tina Tsou, Magnus Westerlund, Delei Yu. Thanks to Bob Briscoe who extensively revised the Operations and Management section.

This document is the result of discussions in the PCN WG and forerunner activity in the TSVWG. A number of previous drafts were presented to TSVWG: [[I-D.chan-pcn-problem-statement](#)], [[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-cl-architecture](#)], [[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-cl-phb](#)], [[I-D.charny-pcn-single-marking](#)], [[I-D.babiarz-pcn-sip-cap](#)], [[I-D.lefaucheur-rsvp-ecn](#)], [[I-D.westberg-pcn-load-control](#)]. The authors of them were: B. Briscoe, P. Eardley, D. Songhurst, F. Le Faucheur, A. Charny, J. Babiarz, K. Chan, S. Dudley, G. Karagiannis, A. Bader, L. Westberg, J. Zhang, V. Liatsos, X-G. Liu, A. Bhargava.

## 13. Comments Solicited

Comments and questions are encouraged and very welcome. They can be addressed to the IETF PCN working group mailing list <pcn@ietf.org>.

## 14. Changes

### 14.1. Changes from -02 to -03

- o Abstract: Clarified by removing the term 'aggregated'. Follow-up clarifications later in draft: S1: expanded PCN-egress-nodes bullet to mention case where the PCN-feedback-information is about one (or a few) PCN-marks, rather than aggregated information; S3 clarified PCN-meter; S5 minor changes; conclusion.
- o S1: added a paragraph about how the PCN-domain looks to the outside world (essentially it looks like a DiffServ domain).

Internet-Draft

Document

February 2008

- o S2: tweaked the PCN-traffic terminology bullet: changed PCN traffic classes to PCN behaviour aggregates, to be more in line with traditional DiffServ jargon (-> follow-up changes later in draft); included a definition of PCN-flows (and corrected a couple of 'PCN microflows' to 'PCN-flows' later in draft)
- o S3.5: added possibility of downgrading to best effort, where PCN-packets arrive at PCN-ingress-node already ECN marked (CE or ECN nonce)
- o S4: added note about whether talk about PCN operating on an interface or on a link. In S8.1 (OAM) mentioned that PCN functionality needs to be configured consistently on either the ingress or the egress interface of PCN-nodes in a PCN-domain.
- o S5.2: clarified that signalling protocol installs flow filter spec at PCN-ingress-node (& updates after possible re-route)
- o S5.6: addressing: clarified
- o S5.7: added tunnelling issue of  $N^2$  scaling if you set up a mesh of tunnels between PCN-boundary-nodes
- o S7.3: Clarified the "third viewpoint" of probing (always probe).
- o S8.1: clarified that SNMP is only an example; added note that an operator may be able to not run PCN on some PCN-interior-nodes, if it knows that these links will never become (pre-)congested; added note that it may be possible to have different PCN-boundary-node behaviours for different ingress-egress-aggregates within the same PCN-domain.
- o Appendix: Created an Appendix about "Possible work items beyond the scope of the current PCN WG Charter". Material moved from near start of S3 and elsewhere throughout draft. Moved text about centralised decision node to Appendix.
- o Other minor clarifications.

## 14.2. Changes from -01 to -02

- o S1: Benefits: provisioning bullet extended to stress that PCN does not use [RFC2475](#)-style traffic conditioning.
- o S1: Deployment models: mentioned, as variant of PCN-domain extending to end nodes, that may extend to LAN edge switch.

Eardley (Editor)

Expires August 11, 2008

[Page 39]

---

Internet-Draft

Document

February 2008

- o S3.1: Trust Assumption: added note about not needing PCN-marking capability if known that an interface cannot become pre-congested.
- o S4: now divided into sub-sections
- o S4.1: Admission control: added second proposed method for how to decide to block new flows (PCN-egress-node receives one (or several) PCN-marked packets).
- o S5: Probing sub-section removed. Material now in new S7.
- o S5.6: Addressing: clarified how PCN-ingress-node can discover address of PCN-egress-node
- o S5.6: Addressing: centralised node case, added that PCN-ingress-node may need to know address of PCN-egress-node
- o S5.8: Tunnelling: added case of "partially PCN-capable tunnel" and degraded bullet on this in S6 (Open Issues)
- o S7: Probing: new section. Much more comprehensive than old S5.5.
- o S8: Operations and Management: substantially revised.
- o other minor changes not affecting semantics

## 14.3. Changes from -00 to -01

In addition to clarifications and nit squashing, the main changes are:

- o S1: Benefits: added one about provisioning (and contrast with

DiffServ SLAs)

- o S1: Benefits: clarified that the objective is also to stop PCN-packets being significantly delayed (previously only mentioned not dropping packets)
- o S1: Deployment models: added one where policing is done at ingress of access network and not at ingress of PCN-domain (assume trust between networks)
- o S1: Deployment models: corrected MPLS-TE to MPLS
- o S2: Terminology: adjusted definition of PCN-domain
- o S3.5: Other assumptions: corrected, so that two assumptions (PCN-nodes not performing ECN and PCN-ingress-node discarding arriving

Eardley (Editor)

Expires August 11, 2008

[Page 40]

---

Internet-Draft

Document

February 2008

CE packet) only apply if the PCN WG decides to encode PCN-marking in the ECN-field.

- o S4 & S5: changed PCN-marking algorithm to marking behaviour
- o S4: clarified that PCN-interior-node functionality applies for each outgoing interface, and added clarification: "The functionality is also done by PCN-ingress-nodes for their outgoing interfaces (ie those 'inside' the PCN-domain)."
- o S4 (near end): altered to say that a PCN-node "should" dedicate some capacity to lower priority traffic so that it isn't starved (was "may")
- o S5: clarified to say that PCN functionality is done on an 'interface' (rather than on a 'link')
- o S5.2: deleted erroneous mention of service level agreement
- o S5.5: Probing: re-written, especially to distinguish probing to test the ingress-egress-aggregate from probing to test a particular ECMP path.
- o S5.7: Addressing: added mention of probing; added that in the case where traffic is always tunnelled across the PCN-domain, add a

note that the PCN-ingress-node needs to know the address of the PCN-egress-node.

- o S5.8: Tunnelling: re-written, especially to provide a clearer description of copying on tunnel entry/exit, by adding explanation (keeping tunnel encaps/decaps and PCN-marking orthogonal), deleting one bullet ("if the inner header's marking state is more severe than it is preserved" - shouldn't happen), and better referencing of other IETF documents.
- o S6: Open issues: stressed that "NOTE: Potential solutions are out of scope for this document" and edited a couple of sentences that were close to solution space.
- o S6: Open issues: added one about scenarios with only one tunnel endpoint in the PCN domain .
- o S6: Open issues: ECMP: added under-admission as another potential risk
- o S6: Open issues: added one about "Silent at start"

- o S10: Conclusions: a small conclusions section added

**15. [Appendix A](#): Possible work items beyond the scope of the current PCN WG Charter**

This section mentions some topics that are outside the PCN WG's current Charter, but which have been mentioned as areas of interest. They might be work items for: the PCN WG after a future re-chartering; some other IETF WG; another standards body; an operator-specific usage that's not standardised.

NOTE: it should be crystal clear that this section discusses possibilities only.

The first set of possibilities relate to the restrictions on scope imposed by the PCN WG Charter (see [Section 3](#)):

- o a single PCN-domain encompasses several autonomous systems that don't trust each other (perhaps by using a mechanism like re-ECN, [[I-D.briscoe-re-pcn-border-cheat](#)]).
- o not all the nodes run PCN. For example, the PCN-domain is a multi-site enterprise network. The sites are connected by a VPN tunnel; although PCN doesn't operate inside the tunnel, the PCN mechanisms still work properly because of the good QoS on the virtual link (the tunnel). Another example is that PCN is deployed on the general Internet (ie widely but not universally deployed).
- o applying the PCN mechanisms to other types of traffic, ie beyond inelastic traffic. For instance, applying the PCN mechanisms to traffic scheduled with the Assured Forwarding per-hop behaviour. One example could be flow-rate adaptation by elastic applications, that adapts according to the pre-congestion information.
- o the aggregation assumption doesn't hold, because the link capacity is too low. Measurement-based admission control is then risky.
- o the applicability of PCN mechanisms for emergency use (911, GETS, WPS, MLPP, etc.)

Other possibilities include:

- o indicating pre-congestion through signalling messages rather than in-band (in the form of PCN-marked packets)

- o the decision-making functionality is at a centralised node rather than at the PCN-boundary-nodes. This requires that the PCN-egress-node signals PCN-feedback-information to the centralised node, and that the centralised node signals to the PCN-ingress-node about the decision about admission (or termination). It may also need the centralised node and the PCN-boundary-nodes to know each others addresses. It would be possible for the centralised node to be one of the PCN-boundary-nodes, when clearly the signalling would sometimes be replaced by a message internal to the node.



- o It would be possible for the centralised node to be one of the PCN-boundary-nodes, when clearly the signalling would sometimes be replaced by a message internal to the node.
- o signalling extensions for specific protocols (eg RSVP, NSIS). For example: the details of how the signalling protocol installs the flowspec at the PCN-ingress-node for an admitted PCN-flow; and how the signalling protocol carries the PCN-feedback-information. Perhaps also for other functions such as: coping with failure of a PCN-boundary-node ([\[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-cl-architecture\]](#) considers what happens if RSVP is the QoS signalling protocol); establishing a tunnel across the PCN-domain if it is necessary to carry ECN marks transparently. Note: There is a PCN WG Milestone on "Requirements for signalling", which is potential input for the appropriate WGs.
- o policing by the PCN-ingress-node may not be needed if the PCN-domain can trust that the upstream network has already policed the traffic on its behalf.
- o PCN for Pseudowire: PCN may be used as a congestion avoidance mechanism for edge to edge pseudowire emulations [\[I-D.ietf-pwe3-congestion-frmwk\]](#).
- o PCN for MPLS: [\[RFC3270\]](#) defines how to support the DiffServ architecture in MPLS networks. [\[RFC5129\]](#) describes how to add PCN for admission control of microflows into a set of MPLS aggregates (Multi-protocol label switching). PCN-marking is done in MPLS's EXP field.
- o PCN for Ethernet: Similarly, it may be possible to extend PCN into Ethernet networks, where PCN-marking is done in the Ethernet header.

.

## [16.](#) Informative References

[\[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-cl-architecture\]](#)

Briscoe, B., "An edge-to-edge Deployment Model for Pre-

Congestion Notification: Admission Control over a DiffServ Region", [draft-briscoe-tsvwg-cl-architecture-04](#) (work in progress), October 2006.

[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-cl-phb]

Briscoe, B., "Pre-Congestion Notification marking", [draft-briscoe-tsvwg-cl-phb-03](#) (work in progress), October 2006.

[I-D.babiarz-pcn-sip-cap]

Babiarz, J., "SIP Controlled Admission and Preemption", [draft-babiarz-pcn-sip-cap-00](#) (work in progress), October 2006.

[I-D.lefaucheur-rsvp-ecn]

Faucheur, F., "RSVP Extensions for Admission Control over Diffserv using Pre-congestion Notification (PCN)", [draft-lefaucheur-rsvp-ecn-01](#) (work in progress), June 2006.

[I-D.chan-pcn-problem-statement]

Chan, K., "Pre-Congestion Notification Problem Statement", [draft-chan-pcn-problem-statement-01](#) (work in progress), October 2006.

[I-D.ietf-pwe3-congestion-frmwk]

Bryant, S., "Pseudowire Congestion Control Framework", [draft-ietf-pwe3-congestion-frmwk-00](#) (work in progress), February 2007.

[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-admitted-realtime-dscp]

"DSCPs for Capacity-Admitted Traffic", November 2006, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/ietf-tsvwg-admitted-realtime-dscp-02.txt>>.

[I-D.briscoe-tsvwg-ecn-tunnel]

"Layered Encapsulation of Congestion Notification", June 2007, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/briscoe-tsvwg-ecn-tunnel-00.txt>>.

[I-D.charny-pcn-single-marking]

"Pre-Congestion Notification Using Single Marking for Admission and Termination", November 2007, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/>

[draft-charny-pcn-single-marking-03.txt](#)>.

[I-D.eardley-pcn-architecture]

"Pre-Congestion Notification Architecture", June 2007, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-eardley-pcn-architecture-00.txt>>.

[I-D.westberg-pcn-load-control]

"LC-PCN: The Load Control PCN Solution", November 2007, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-westberg-pcn-load-control-02.txt>>.

[I-D.behringer-tsvwg-rsvp-security-groupkeying]

"Applicability of Keying Methods for RSVP Security", November 2007, <<http://www.watersprings.org/pub/id/draft-behringer-tsvwg-rsvp-security-groupkeying-01.txt>>.

[I-D.briscoe-re-pcn-border-cheat]

"Emulating Border Flow Policing using Re-ECN on Bulk Data", June 2006, <<http://www.watersprings.org/pub/id/briscoe-re-pcn-border-cheat-01.txt>>.

[I-D.[draft-babiarz-pcn-3sm](#)]

"Three State PCN Marking", November 2007, <<http://www.watersprings.org/pub/id/draft-babiarz-pcn-3sm-01.txt>>.

[RFC5129] "Explicit Congestion Marking in MPLS", [RFC 5129](#), January 2008.

[RFC4303] Kent, S., "IP Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP)", [RFC 4303](#), December 2005.

[RFC2475] Blake, S., Black, D., Carlson, M., Davies, E., Wang, Z., and W. Weiss, "An Architecture for Differentiated Services", [RFC 2475](#), December 1998.

[RFC3246] Davie, B., Charny, A., Bennet, J., Benson, K., Le Boudec, J., Courtney, W., Davari, S., Firoiu, V., and D. Stiliadis, "An Expedited Forwarding PHB (Per-Hop Behavior)", [RFC 3246](#), March 2002.

[RFC4594] Babiarz, J., Chan, K., and F. Baker, "Configuration Guidelines for DiffServ Service Classes", [RFC 4594](#), August 2006.

[RFC3168] Ramakrishnan, K., Floyd, S., and D. Black, "The Addition of Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) to IP",

Internet-Draft

Document

February 2008

- [RFC2211] Wroclawski, J., "Specification of the Controlled-Load Network Element Service", [RFC 2211](#), September 1997.
- [RFC2998] Bernet, Y., Ford, P., Yavatkar, R., Baker, F., Zhang, L., Speer, M., Braden, R., Davie, B., Wroclawski, J., and E. Felstaine, "A Framework for Integrated Services Operation over Diffserv Networks", [RFC 2998](#), November 2000.
- [RFC3270] Le Faucheur, F., Wu, L., Davie, B., Davari, S., Vaananen, P., Krishnan, R., Cheval, P., and J. Heinanen, "Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) Support of Differentiated Services", [RFC 3270](#), May 2002.
- [RFC1633] Braden, B., Clark, D., and S. Shenker, "Integrated Services in the Internet Architecture: an Overview", [RFC 1633](#), June 1994.
- [RFC2983] Black, D., "Differentiated Services and Tunnels", [RFC 2983](#), October 2000.
- [RFC2747] Baker, F., Lindell, B., and M. Talwar, "RSVP Cryptographic Authentication", [RFC 2747](#), January 2000.
- [RFC3411] Harrington, D., Presuhn, R., and B. Wijnen, "An Architecture for Describing Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) Management Frameworks", STD 62, [RFC 3411](#), December 2002.
- [RFC3393] Demichelis, C. and P. Chimento, "IP Packet Delay Variation Metric for IP Performance Metrics (IPPM)", [RFC 3393](#), November 2002.
- [RFC4656] Shalunov, S., Teitelbaum, B., Karp, A., Boote, J., and M. Zekauskas, "A One-way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP)", [RFC 4656](#), September 2006.
- [RFC4778] Kaeo, M., "Operational Security Current Practices in Internet Service Provider Environments", [RFC 4778](#), January 2007.

[ITU-MLPP] "Multilevel Precedence and Pre-emption Service (MLPP)", ITU-T Recommendation I.255.3, 1990.

[Iyer] "An approach to alleviate link overload as observed on an IP backbone", IEEE INFOCOM , 2003, <[http://www.ieee-infocom.org/2003/papers/10\\_04.pdf](http://www.ieee-infocom.org/2003/papers/10_04.pdf)>.

Eardley (Editor)

Expires August 11, 2008

[Page 46]

---

Internet-Draft

Document

February 2008

[Shenker] "Fundamental design issues for the future Internet", IEEE Journal on selected areas in communications pp 1176 - 1188, Vol 13 (7), 1995.

[Y.1541] "Network Performance Objectives for IP-based Services", ITU-T Recommendation Y.1541, February 2006.

[P.800] "Methods for subjective determination of transmission quality", ITU-T Recommendation P.800, August 1996.

[Songhurst] "Guaranteed QoS Synthesis for Admission Control with Shared Capacity", BT Technical Report TR-CXR9-2006-001, February 2006, <[http://www.cs.ucl.ac.uk/staff/B.Briscoe/projects/ipe2eqos/gqs/papers/GQS\\_shared\\_tr.pdf](http://www.cs.ucl.ac.uk/staff/B.Briscoe/projects/ipe2eqos/gqs/papers/GQS_shared_tr.pdf)>.

[Menth] "PCN-Based Resilient Network Admission Control: The Impact of a Single Bit", Technical Report , 2007, <<http://www3.informatik.uni-wuerzburg.de/staff/menth/Publications/Menth07-PCN-Config.pdf>>.

[PCN-email-ECMP] "Email to PCN WG mailing list", November 2007, <<http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/pcn/current/msg00871.html>>.

[PCN-email-traffic-empty-aggregates] "Email to PCN WG mailing list", October 2007, <<http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/pcn/current/msg00831.html>>.

Author's Address

Philip Eardley

BT  
B54/77, Sirius House Adastral Park Martlesham Heath  
Ipswich, Suffolk IP5 3RE  
United Kingdom

Email: philip.eardley@bt.com

Eardley (Editor)

Expires August 11, 2008

[Page 47]

---

Internet-Draft

Document

February 2008

#### Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2008).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

#### Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be

found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

#### Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is provided by the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA).