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?)