

TCP Maintenance and Minor Extensions (TCPM) Working Group Status

Yoshifumi Nishida

Pasi Sarolahti

Michael Scharf

IETF 87 – Berlin, Germany

July 2013

Note Well

This summary is only meant to point you in the right direction, and doesn't have all the nuances. The IETF's IPR Policy is set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

The brief summary:

- ❖ **By participating with the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes.**
- ❖ **If you are aware that a contribution of yours (something you write, say, or discuss in any IETF context) is covered by patents or patent applications, you need to disclose that fact.**
- ❖ **You understand that meetings might be recorded, broadcast, and publicly archived.**

For further information, talk to a chair, ask an Area Director, or review the following:

BCP 9 (on the Internet Standards Process)

BCP 25 (on the Working Group processes)

BCP 78 (on the IETF Trust)

BCP 79 (on Intellectual Property Rights in the IETF)

Agenda

- Agenda bash & WG status (5 min)
- WG items
 - draft-ietf-tcpm-1323bis-14 (20min)
 - draft-ietf-tcpm-fastopen-04 (15min)
 - draft-ietf-tcpm-newcwv-02 (20min)
 - draft-ietf-tcpm-rtorestart-00 (10min)
 - draft-ietf-tcpm-accecn-reqs-02 (5min)
- Individual Submissions
 - draft-zimmermann-tcpm-tcp-rfc4614bis-02 (10min)
 - draft-dukkipati-tcpm-tcp-loss-probe-01 (10min)
 - draft-flach-tcpm-fec-00 (15min)
 - draft-gont-tcpm-tcp-seq-validation-00 (10min)
 - draft-kuehlewind-tcpm-ecn-fallback-00 (5min)
 - draft-kuehlewind-tcpm-accurate-ecn-02 (10min)
- If time permits
 - PRR effects (5min)
 - Dealing with sequence-number randomizing firewalls (5min)

TCP Experimental Option Registry

- TCP Experimental Option Experiment Identifier (ExID)
- Defined in draft-ietf-tcpm-experimental-options (Proposed Standard)
- Protocols using the TCP experimental option codepoints (253,254)...
 - SHOULD use the ExIDs even if deployed in controlled environments
 - MUST use the ExID if deployed outside controlled environments
 - MUST register those ExIDs with IANA
- IANA registry: ***<http://www.iana.org/assignments/tcp-parameters/tcp-parameters.xhtml#tcp-exids>***
 - All current known uses have registered
 - Add your ExID: ***<http://www.iana.org/protocols/apply>***
- Very lightweight registration - only three parameters:
 - Value (in HEX, 16- or 32-bits)
 - Registrant name and email
 - Description (including a reference, if available)

HTTP/2 and Transport Joint Meeting

- Scheduled for Friday, 09:00-11:00 (Morning Session I)
- Planned topics
 - HTTP/2 With A Transport Eye
 - Flow Control
 - Priorities
 - Initial Window Size
 - General Discussion / Other Issues

Status of Documents

Recent RFCs

- Proportional Rate Reduction for TCP
(draft-ietf-tcpm-proportional-rate-reduction)
Milestone Target: Experimental in May 2012
Status: RFC 6937 (May 2013)
- Increasing the Initial Window
(draft-ietf-tcpm-initcwnd)
Milestone Target: Experimental in September 2011
Status: RFC 6928 (April 2013)

WG Items Nearing RFC Publication

- Shared Use of Experimental TCP Options
(draft-ietf-tcpm-experimental-options)
Milestone Target: PS in Sept. 2012
Status: RFC Editor's queue

WG Items in WGLC or being revised

- TCP Extensions for High Performance
(draft-ietf-tcpm-1323bis)
Milestone Target: Proposed Standard in July 2009
Status: Second WGLC planned soon

Active WG Items

- TCP Fast Open
(draft-ietf-tcpm-fastopen)
Milestone Target: Experimental in Sept. 2012
Status: Needs reviews by WG
- Updating TCP to support Variable-Rate Traffic
(draft-ietf-tcpm-newcwv)
Milestone Target: Status decided by Aug. 2013; submission in Nov. 2013
Status: Recently updated
- TCP and SCTP RTO Restart
(draft-ietf-tcpm-rtorestart)
Milestone Target: Experimental in Aug. 2013
Status: No update since last meeting
- Problem Statement and Requirements for a More Accurate ECN Feedback
(draft-ietf-tcpm-accecn-reqs)
Milestone Target: Informational in Nov. 2013
Status: Small update since last meeting

Individual Drafts

- Several new individual submissions
- See WG status email for longer list
- Thoughts on WG adoption of experimental work
 - “Hurrah” effect during the meetings
 - Lot’ s of support for WG adoption
 - But: Authors hardly get feedback / reviews afterwards
 - Slow progress of some WG items
 - Good exception: Broad community feedback on IW10
 - Chairs need *committed reviewers*
 - Reports from implementation and tests are welcome in TCPM!