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Draft-ietf-pcn-architecture-04

• Summary
  – No technical open issues
  – Rev ASAP with a few nits, clarifications…
  – Ready for WG Last Call

• Changes
  – to reflect consensus decisions on marking behaviour (at Philadelphia)
  – to reflect that current encoding has a STDS baseline proposal & then EXP extension(s)
  – Restructuring of Introduction to improve clarity
  – Added section about Backwards compatibility (RFC4774)
Draft-eardley-pcn-marking-behaviour-01

• Summary
  – Request to make this a WG doc
  – Rev needed, but the basics are mature

• Changes from 00 to 01
  – to reflect consensus decisions on marking behaviour (at Philadelphia)
  – to reflect that current encoding has a STDS baseline proposal & then EXP extension(s)
  – (Traffic conditioning – to be changed again)

• Changes planned for 02 (WG-00)
  – Traffic conditioning – simplify
  – Make it purely PHB
  – Threshold & excess rate marking both MUSTs?
Traffic conditioning on PCN-interior-nodes

• PCN-traffic:
  – Drop pkts (queue overflows) &/or flow termination
  – Per hop Policing not needed

• Non-PCN-traffic
  – ie shares the same capacity as PCN (at same or higher priority), maybe not admission controlled
  – “The goal of PCN is to keep PCN traffic within some bandwidth on a link. If the bandwidth is also used for something else, this presents dangers & there must be a mechanism to limit it. How to do this is out of scope of PCN: see DiffServ docs & ieft-tsvwg-admitted-realtime-dscp”
  – Appendix discuss this a bit, eg 2 cases:
    • PCN & non-PCN share queue: MUST police non-PCN
    • PCN & non-PCN separate queues: MUST police non-PCN
PHB

• This document is about PCN-interior-node PHB

• PDB stuff: create a new doc, covering eg
  – Traffic conditioning on PCN-ingress-nodes
  – Whole PCN-domain things
  – how use PHB stuff in a PCN-domain
Both marking behaviours MUSTs?

• Should they both be MUSTs to do?
  – silly

• Should they both be MUSTs to implement?
  – +: migration easier

• Should they be a conditional MUST?
  – If you do threshold-marking, MUST do x
  – If you do excess-traffic-marking, MUST do y
  – +: implementation easier