L4S Status Recap

Document shepherd: Wes Eddy (wes@mti-systems.com)

IETF 108 – Virtual Meeting

Issues List Status

- 12 issues still open in tracker
  - https://trac.ietf.org/trac/tsvwg/report/1?sort=ticket&asc=1&page=1
  - The plan from chairs has been to close these through WG discussion and any needed changes prior to doing a WGLC on the document suite:
    - https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-tsvwg-l4s-arch/
    - https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-tsvwg-ecn-l4s-id/
    - https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-tsvwg-aqm-dualq-coupled/

- The issue on use of ECT(1) was closed since last meeting.

- Several others have been proposed for closing, but the mailing list discussions don't seem to have totally converged.

- Some may be awaiting editorial actions or follow-up.

Open Issue: Interaction w/ 3168-only ECN AQMs

- https://trac.ietf.org/trac/tsvwg/ticket/16
- Classic bottleneck detection seems to be of great interest to the group, but at present the WG does not seem to think this is safe enough to rely on.
- Big thread on list, but didn't seem to conclude definitively.
- Other additional/alternatives enumerated by Jake Holland on the list:
  - https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/tsvwg/yPX9QCitf2g_Kf2vGIjl1mLMzhM/
  - Includes several possible ideas: 2-signal approach, flag day, ECT(1)->Not-ECT, policing strategies, public whitelist.
  - **Need to understand what the editors and others are thinking to move forward.**

Open Issue: Terminology improvements

- Two goals:
    1. Address disputed terms: "traditional", "classic", "legacy".
        - WG seemed to agree to replace "classic TCP", but leave "classic congestion control".
        - Editors have checked that "traditional" is used appropriately.
        - There is still some use of "legacy" in the architecture draft.
    2. Desire to reduce "hype".
        - Editors have completed this.
- https://trac.ietf.org/trac/tsvwg/ticket/27

- **Proposed on-list to close this issue.**
- **WG should review the latest documents, and send any additional specific changes that are needed.**

Open Issue: Admission control / untrusted marking

- Use of a queue protection function is discussed but not required in the architecture draft.
  - DOCSIS example is referenced.
- https://trac.ietf.org/trac/tsvwg/ticket/26
- This seems very close to being ready for closure.
  - It's not clear if the thread ended with agreement, or if a bit more discussion is needed.
  - Can determining the answer to this be part of the outline for experimentation with L4S?

Issues that should probably be closed

- **To be confirmed on mailing list:**
  - #19 "Single codepoint for both low latency & resequencing tolerance"
    - The reordering tolerance issue seems to have been taken care of adequately.
  - #21 "CE codepoint semantics"
    - Results of this fall underneath issues #16 and #17.
    - Mixed signals from mailing list thread on closing this.
  - #29 "classic bottleneck detection can misidentify L4S queues as RFC 3168 queues"
    - This falls under #16, and also seems specific to Prague rather than this set of TSVWG L4S documents.

Do we need further interim meetings?