

Draft-ietf-pcn-architecture-02

Philip Eardley

3 Dec 2007, IETF-70, Vancouver

Since last ietf

- Now a WG draft
- 3 Revs
- Dealt with all comments > 2 weeks
 - Thanks for all comments & contributions
- Main changes
 - Expanded text on probing (01 to 02)
 - Heavily revised section on OAM (01 to 02)
 - Tunnelling re-written (00 to 01)
 - ? (to 00 from individual)

Issues – email 22 Nov

- Review the new OAM (Section 8)
 - “OK”
- Check revised text on partially PCN-capable tunnel
- Review the expanded text about Probing
 - Discusses reasons that have been suggested for probing
 - Architecture draft will continue to summarise /document this discussion
 - Some follow-up comments from Michael Menth

'New' issues (1)

- Clarifications & improvements & suggestions from Michael Menth, (soon) Joe Babiarz
 - Several wording improvements etc
 - (intro) make clearer concept that STD interior marking behaviour + different PCN-boundary-node behaviours. List of bullets called 'Deployment models' mixes several types of things
 - Terminology proposals...
- Comments from Rob Hancock
 - Explain how PCN-domain looks to outside world
 - How does PCN-domain know if PCN-traffic
 - Significance of inelastic traffic assumption
 - ECN (see later)
- Comment from Steven Blake
 - "Is centralised decision-making node in scope for architecture? I've a strong opinion"
 - Does anything need changing?

'New' issues (2)

- Addressing (Magnus): need to describe better how know address of PCN-egress-node, how egress associates traffic to particular ingress-egress-aggregate
- what the options are
 - Pick-up from signalling (RSVP, NSIS)
 - MPLS
 - Always tunnelled
 - Routing table
 - Centralised node
 - Info is inside probe packet

'New' issues (3)

- Relationship with ECN
 - Mainly affects options for encoding PCN-markings
- Lots of discussion
 - prompted by current text about how to handle traffic that arrives for PCN class, where that traffic is also ECN
- Current draft implies this is unusual, but push-back
 - “don't assume ECN will only apply to TCP in the future – may have ECN traffic that also gets adm ctrl”
 - “could use ECN as congestion indication in multihop wireless”
- Don't like current proposal how to handle PCN-traffic arriving that's also ECN
 - [ie assuming impossible to find PCN solution that's simple enough to get initial deployment & avoids trampling ECN bits]
 - new proposal: re-classify flow as non-PCN & pass transparently through PCN-domain

WG Last call

- What needs to be fixed before Last call?
- Does it need to wait for anything else? (eg encoding comparisons draft?)