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http://trac.tools.ietf.org/group/irtf/trac/wiki/ICCRG_newcwv
RFC2861 had a good motivation (protect the network)

However, too conservative for apps to benefit.

Not widely implemented or used.

Propose to obsolete RFC 2861, and define something else.
IETF diff between -03 and -04

ICCRG feedback

Used term rate-limited in all places.

Added justification and minor changes suggested on the list.

Added text to tie-in with more accurate ECN marking.

Added ref to Hug01 (but did not specify pacing)
IETF diff between -04 and -05

Fixed issue for infrequent large bursts:
• Non-Validated Period (NVP)
• Introduced pipeACK, to replace FlightSize
• This reflects actual acknowledged usage

Changed NVP entry to pipeACK < $\frac{1}{2} \times \text{cwnd}$

Changed NVP exit conditions:
• pipeACK leaves NVP after pipe was acknowledged.
• Removed need for hysteresis.
Key Features

Differentiate between Validated & Non-Validated Phases

Validated: Standard behaviour

Non-Validated: Updated behaviour
- ssthresh adjusted
- Different rate reduction for loss (D-R)/2
- cwnd does not increase
- cwnd decreases after NVP
Varying pipeACK
With new-cwv, the cwnd does not grow beyond 2*pipeACK
Varying pipeACK (around $\frac{1}{2}$ cwnd)
new-cwv behaviour reduces cwnd after 5 minutes by $\frac{1}{2}$
cwnd tracks pipeACK (III)

Varying pipeACK (around ½ cwnd)
new-cwv behaviour tracks pipe
Why is NVP 5 mins?

There is no “magic number”

Characteristic idle periods ~ few secs to few minutes

Network paths are relatively stable for several minutes

TCP default user timeout of 5 minutes - how long transmitted data may be unacknowledged before closed.

Expected to be sufficient for common apps
Updates planned for -06

Require reset of pipeACK after congestion

Added comment on effect of congestion after a short burst (M. Allman)

Correction of minor typos to improve consistency
Next Steps

We think this is a problem we should address

Outstanding issues:
  • IW has similarities, but is different (see draft)
  • Laminar is different (but this proposal for STD TCP)
  • Tail loss can also be an issue for bursty apps

We think this is a useful starting point for this work

We would like to see this adopted as a TCPM work item!
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