

Considerations for Assigning a new Recommended DSCP

Ana Custura, Gorry Fairhurst, Raffaello Secchi

draft-ietf-tsvwg-dscp-considerations-04

- pathologies and existing mappings that should be considered by new DSCP assignments
- **in WG last call (rev 03)**
- **revision 04 just uploaded**

WG last call comments

- Thanks to : Ruedieger Geib, Brian Carpenter, Jim Rampley
- Major issues (2):
 - Clarify document scope and audience
 - Avoid any suggestion that RFC 8100 isn't compliant with the DS architecture
- New revision seeks to address both of these.

WG last call comments

- Minor issues (17):
 - Pathology Observed remarking behaviour
 - ~~Non-diffserv aware~~ Configured to operate on the former ToS precedence field
 - Clarify terminology between DiffServ nodes/domains (RFC3086)
 - Added in-depth text on mappings specified for mobile/MPLS
 - Reference RFC 2474 on DiffServ remarking in case of DoS/theft and in connection to network control traffic
 - ‘service class’ - now references RFCs 4594(node) and 3086(domain)
 - ...and other minor text revisions
- New revision also has text to address these, more details in [Github](#).



RFC 4594

- In reviewing relevant RFCs, the editors found this in RFC 4594:
"In network segments that use IP precedence marking, only one of the two service classes can be supported, High-Throughput Data or Low-Priority Data. We RECOMMEND that the DSCP value(s) of the unsupported service class be changed to 000xx1 on ingress and changed back to original value(s) on egress of the network segment that uses precedence marking. For example, if Low-Priority Data is mapped to Standard service class, then 000001 DSCP marking MAY be used to distinguish it from Standard marked packets on egress."
- At the time RFC 4594 was written (2006), there was a "running code" concern, and this RFC recommendation described a local use.
- RFC 8436 reassigned Pool 3 to IANA standards action (2018), and RFC 8622 assigned DSCP 1 from this pool.

-

Editor's question?

- RFC 8436 reassigned Pool 3 to IANA standards action, and RFC 8622 assigned the IE PHB from this pool.

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+							
56/CS7	57	58	59	60	61	62	63
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+							
48/CS6	49	50	51	52	53	54	55
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+							
40/CS5	41	42	43	44/VA	45	46/EF	47
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+							
32/CS4	33	34/AF41	35	36/AF42	37	38/AF43	39
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+							
24/CS3	25	26/AF31	27	28/AF32	29	30/AF33	31
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+							
16/CS2	17	18/AF21	19	20/AF22	21	22/AF23	23
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+							
8/CS1	9	10/AF11	11	12/AF12	13	14/AF13	15
+=====+=====+=====+=====+=====+=====+=====+=====+							
0/CS0	1/LE*	2	3*	4	5*	6	7*
+=====+=====+=====+=====+=====+=====+=====+=====+							

- Is it helpful to add a foot note that says (TBC):

"*RFC 4594 recommended a local use of DSCPs 000xx1 binary. RFC 8436 changed the IANA registration policy of Pool 3, xxxx01 binary to assignment by Standards Action, this pool includes DSCP 1 and DSCP 5."

- This draft does not plan to modify the assignment of DSCP 5 - please refer to other WG drafts.

Are we finished?

Please check the latest revision!

Submit issues on Github:

`https://github.com/uaaerg/draft-tsvwg-dscp-considerations/issues`