TCP Alternative Backoff with ECN (ABE)

draft-ietf-tcpm-alternativebackoff-ecn-06

Naeem Khademi, Michael Welzl, Grenville Armitage, Gorry Fairhurst

TCPM @ IETF 101
19. 03. 2018

Thank you for comments!

- We had a detailed review from Michael Scharf before WGLC and updated the draft
- During WGLC, from Richard Scheffenegger:
  - Some of the I-D references are already RFCs (also M. Tüxen)
  - "I'm wondering if some generic rules-of-thumb, as to what a reasonable beta_loss vs. beta_ecn adjustment would be in this RFC might be in order (although I agree, that CCs should come up with reasonable guidance there)."
    - Our answer: it really depends on the CC
    - Note: our draft already says "The results of these tests indicate that CUBIC connections benefit from beta_{ecn} of 0.85 (cf. beta_{loss} = 0.7)"

Comments from Markku Kojo

1. Wrong statement in section 4.1 ("Why Use ECN to Vary the Degree of Backoff?") related to timeout
   - We'll remove this paragraph

2. Specify what happens when cwnd == ssthresh
   - Suggest to be conservative + conform with previous versions: Congestion Avoidance only, which is only clearly the case when cwnd > ssthresh
   - Explain that there is a "grey area" that, in RFC 5681 style, *"may benefit from additional attention, experimentation and specification."*
   - Suggest to include cwnd **<=** ssthresh in this

Comment from Markku Kojo /2

- Concern about lower bound of 2*SMSS
  - We will clarify that our modified backoff factor applies to adjusting ssthresh and cwnd upon receipt of ECN mark
  - As before, cwnd may be reduced below ssthresh

- ABE is only about changing the backoff factor