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History and status

- **draft-hadi-forces-sctptml-00.txt**
  - June 2006
  - Mentions rationale for SCTP based TML
  - Accepted as WG item
  - Deferred due to other priorities (protocol, model, ...) at that time
    - Now almost finalized

- **draft-ietf-forces-sctptml-00.txt**
  - Release very first version as a WG draft
SCTP vs TCP, UDP, DCCP

Vs TCP:
- provide ordered, reliable, connection oriented, flow controlled, congestion controlled data exchange
- It does not provide byte streaming rather messages

Vs UDP:
- provide message boundaries, unordered, unreliable data exchange
- Does not provide multicast

Vs DCCP:
- Can provide unreliable, ordered, congestion controlled data exchange
Additional services unique to SCTP

- Multi-homing
- Runtime IP binding (via ADDIP)
- A range of reliability shades + congestion control
- Built-in heartbeating
- Multi-streaming
- Message boundaries + reliability
- Improved SYN DOS protection
- Simpler transport events
- Simplified replicasting
So why SCTP?

- Mainly an all in one package
  - All other proposals require >1 protocol
  - Allows for a much simpler programming

- Very mature (relative to DCCP for example)
  - Has been around for a few years
  - Widely deployed

- Provides more features with little effort
  - Example HA
  - Multiple streams for data vs control separation
Meeting TML requirements (1/4)
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Meeting TML requirements (2/4)

- Reliability
  - It is possible to have reliable data exchange

- Congestion control
  - All data exchange is congestion controlled

- Timeliness
  - Message can be time limited in PR-SCTP
    - If a message is not sent after timeout it is junked locally
      - a Forward-TSN message sent to remote to skip message
    - If a message is acknowledged after timeout, it is ignored
Meeting TML requirements (3/4)

- Prioritization
  - Multiple streams can be made to be prioritized
    - The stream scheduler on Linux is incapable today
      - Some code is needed

- PL Addressing to peers
  - SCTP can be told to replicast a packet it receives (in the kernel) to several destinations
    - Not as good as UDP multicast, but saves local system memory bandwidth in multi-VM domain OSes (Unixes)

- Encapsulation
  - None needed by TML (if needed add new TLVs/chunks)
Meeting TML requirements (4/4)

- **HA**
  - Multi-homing provides path diversity
    - When peer-IP is unreachable other can be accessed without TMLs intervention
  - Reachability fault detection
    - Built in HB on a per-peer IP address
    - Data transmission threshold on a per-peer IP address
  - Can coordinate migration of IP addresses from one node to another
    - ADDIP: allows adding IP of peers at runtime
Discussion

- Should SCTP be mandatory?
  - We think so because of unique protocol meeting all TML requirements

- Other open issues?