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Requirements

- Aim to provide sufficient functionality to make PCN work
- Should be extensible to allow both experiments and charter extension
- Should minimise use of DSCPs
- Has to work within current tunnelling constraints
- Ideally should allow ECN to be carried end-to-end in some manner
## Current Proposal (as at 02)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not-ECN</th>
<th>ECT(0)</th>
<th>ECT(1)</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSCP \ NM</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Current suggestion uses both ECT codepoints as Not Marked
- DSCP1 might be Voice-Admit
- Marked state is interpreted locally depending on marking scheme in use
- ECN would need to be tunnelled
Intended Change for 03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not-ECN</th>
<th>ECT(0)</th>
<th>ECT(1)</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSCP</td>
<td>Not-PCN</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>EXP/LU</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Suggestion is to change ECT(1) to EXP/LU
- This allows for multiple experimental extensions (see later)
- Marked state is still interpreted locally depending on marking scheme in use
- ECN would need to be tunnelled
Next Steps

- Will release updated version to reflect the change shown on previous slide
- Would like to see this adopted as WG draft
- Feel this is simplest possible baseline encoding that gives greatest possible extensibility
- This would give a clear unambiguous standard that would not need to be replaced (just updated) should any experiment prove successful
Questions?

- toby.moncaster@bt.com
- bob.briscoe@bt.com
- menth@informatik.uni-wuerzburg.de