

SCONEPRO Questions from IETF 119

Matt Joras and Spencer Dawkins

Current status after IETF 119

- We've had many post-IETF 119 discussions about SCONEPRO
 - Directly on the [SADCDN mailing list](#), and reflected on the mailing list from [GitHub](#)
- [Eight drafts with -SCONEPRO- in the filename](#) have been submitted
 - Most are intended to answer questions raised at the IETF 119 BOF
 - *This presentation isn't about those drafts*
- The [proposed SCONEPRO charter](#) has changed significantly
 - [Just in the past month](#), we've merged 8 PRs and closed 19 issues
 - A number of the "closed" issues cover topics that should be addressed by a WG
 - *This presentation isn't a review of issues and PRs, whether open or closed, or the curcharter text*
- ***Please help us identify any open questions that we've missed***
 - The chairs allocated time for discussion of all open questions later in the agenda.

Scope of the SCONEPRO protocol

- We have focused pretty clearly on
 - **network-to-host signaling**
 - **all networks (not just mobile)**
- **List of out of scope items in the charter!**
 - That was our takeaway from IETF 119 BOF, and from our AD
- Are we doing the right thing?
 - The chairs will ask this question during our discussion time

Extensibility

- We have focused on one, very specific, use case with one goal
 - The target media must be ABR video carried in QUIC
 - Network properties must be related to improving throughput
- The current charter reflects this
 - "primary objective is to specify a 'maximum achievable throughput' property"
- Are we doing the right thing?
 - The chairs will ask this question during our discussion time

Privacy

- There's an ongoing conversation about the impact on user privacy
 - When a host "opts in" to SCONEPRO, the carrier **knows** this is for ABR video
 - We recognize that this is telling the carrier something explicitly
 - The carriers already know about ABR video usage
- Privacy analysis would be an ongoing activity
 - So, properly performed by the working group, as part of protocol specification
- Are we doing the right thing?
 - The chairs will ask this question during our discussion time

Security and Trust

- SCONEPRO requires at least some host-network trust
 - A SCONEPRO host would be believing the network on what's achievable
- We reported some results from a proof of concept at IETF 119
 - These results showed that the broad strokes are possible
 - We are **not proposing a specific design** from that POC
- We think SCONEPRO is **optional** and **advisory**
 - No one has to use SCONEPRO, and no one has to use SCONEPRO
 - ...for both endpoints and the network
- Are we doing the right thing?
 - The chairs will ask this question during our discussion time

Aligned Incentives

- Internet Video Users
 - Improved quality of experience when shaping would have been used
 - Equal opportunity for smaller video providers
- Carriers and operators
 - Traffic shaping is computationally intensive and prone to errors
 - Many errors are due to carriers using heuristics in the absence of information
- Are we doing the right thing?
 - The chairs will ask this question during our discussion time

Net Neutrality

- This was raised at the IETF 119 BOF and discussed in many places
 - SCONEPRO is fundamentally not changing anything.
 - This is an "Internet tussle" between Internet goals and carrier realities
- Are we doing the right thing?
 - The chairs will ask this question during our discussion time