Status

- WGLC concluded in Nov
- -08 update submitted in March addressing all WGLC comments (0 open issues)
- Thanks to Lucas, MT, Magnus, Kazuho, Marten, Gorry, and Ingemar!
  - ToDo: add thanks to acknowledgement section (see PR #285)
Overview Issues (1): Editorial/Clarifications

- Editorial:
  - #224, #226, #229, #230, #231, #233, #237, #239, #241, #242, #243, #246, #247, #251

- Clarifications:
  - #227: clarification on ways to request one ACK per RTT (PR #287)
  - #228: clarification when to send ACK_FREQUENCY frame (PR #275)
  - #236: seq# must be monotonically increasing (#259)
  - #238: IMMEDIATE_ACK frames cannot be sent in 0-RTT packets
  - #248: example clarification (PR #274)
  - #240: IMMEDIATE_ACK frames are congestion controlled
Overview Issues (2): Closed without action

- Closed without action
  - #225: reordering threshold and ECN are different things...
  - #232: maximum value of min_ack_delay is defined by max_ack_delay
  - #234: "negotiation" clarification was already fixed by PR #252
  - #244: not every CE is ack’ed; only a change between CE and Non-CE
    - further optimization are left for future version! (see also mail from Ingemar)
  - #245: send ACK soon after idle period?
    - out-of-scope for this draft to further specify this!
Overview Issues (3): Normative impact

#235: Max value of Max Ack Delay

- PR #276: Clarify that it’s the same as max_ack_delay from RFC 9000
- PR #284:
  - MUST->SHOULD:
    “On receipt of a valid value, the endpoint SHOULD update its max_ack_delay to the value provided by the peer”
  - TRANSPORT_PARAMETER_ERROR -> FRAME_ENCODING_ERROR
    (on receipt of an invalid value)

#253: No change in ack behavior before the first ACK_FREQUENCY frame?

- PR #277:
  “If the Ack-Eliciting Threshold is larger than 1, an endpoint SHOULD send an immediate acknowledgement when a packet marked with the ECN Congestion Experienced (CE) {{?RFC3168}} codepoint in the IP header is received and the previously received packet was not marked CE.”
Next steps

- One fully editorial PR (#279) by Tatsuhiro to add table to examples
  - Is that helpful? Should we merge?
- 11 March 2024: Email by Ingemar on use of max_ack_delay for sending ACKs for CE
  - Related to issue #244 and is an optimization for the future?
- 2 Nov 2023: Email by Gorry: “My request is to RECOMMEND at least 1 ACK/RTT when sending data”
  - When discussed in issues #168 and #227, decision was to not include normative text.

Chairs plan to run a second WGLC after the Brisbane meeting!