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IETF 108 – Virtual Meeting
Issues List Status

• 12 issues still open in tracker
  • 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:

• 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/yPX9QCif2g_Kf2vGljl1mLMzhM/
  • 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](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](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?