A Lower Effort
Per-Hop-Behavior
draft-ietf-tsvwg-le-phb-04

Roland Bless

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT)

bless@kit.edu

Changes to -03/-04

- Changed recommended codepoint to 000001 (thanks to draft-ietf-tsvwg-dscp-registry)
- Added text to explain the reasons for the DSCP choice
- Removed LE-min, LE-strict discussion
- Added privacy considerations to the security section
- Changed IANA considerations section
- Several editorial changes (review from Gorry Fairhurst)
- Changed the section structure a bit (moved subsections 1.1 and 1.2 into own sections 3 and 7 respectively)
- updated section 2 on requirements language
- added updates to RFC 8325 (Mapping DiffServ to 802.11)
- tried to be more explicit what changes are required to RFCs 4594 and 8325

Review comments

- Rüdiger Geib's comments: mainly editorial → will be considered in next revision
- Bob Briscoe's suggestion with respect to congestion control: MUST use LBE congestion control unless …
- My current view:
    - LE user suggests LE PHB use, but does not care if traffic gets better treatment in provider domains that use BE instead (provider doesn't care either) [LE-min semantic]
    - LE user wants to ensure „no harm" property even if provider uses BE instead [LE-strict semantic]
      → use transport with LBE congestion control, e.g., LEDBAT++

Next Steps

- Further discussion on the congestion control issue welcome
- PHB Guidelines from RFC 2475
  - G.7: anything special to be considered for tunneling? RFC 2983 sufficient?
  - G.9: minimal conformance requirements?
  - G.10: security considerations complete?
  - G.15: recommended mappings to link-layer QoS mechanisms
- Update draft to -05
- WGLC for -05 version?