

SCTP TML update

Forwarding and Control Element Separation WG

Kentaro Ogawa <ogawa.kentaro@lab.ntt.co.jp>

Jamal Hadi Salim <hadi@mojatatu.com>

General status

- Version 4 of draft released June 2009
- We hope to LC soon after Stockholm
- We hope to get approval for publication before Hiroshima
 - Free the other 3 docs from the RFC editor queue

Update since Version 2

- Feedback since Version 2 from Evangelos and Joel
 - We have added clarity to scheduling
 - We have dropped TLS from the security section
 - There are some elements of TLS+SCTP which are not standardized yet
 - Discussed in SF
 - We have moved the non-normative text on scheduling etc to the appendices

Update since Interop

- We found we had one extra PL priority not used
 - We want to reserve one priority
 - Poll: Should we reserve highest or lowest prio?
- Draft “recommends” priority range for PL messages
 - Original intent was to leave it upto implementation
 - This caused a little bit of a chaos as every implementation interpreted it their way
 - Feedback from Chuanhuang Li
 - We are going to enforce (MUST) PL mapping of messages priority, and channel

Update since Interop

- Talked to SCTP core people (Michael Tuxen et al)
 - We need to ask for 3 SCTP PPID from IANA