A Lower Effort Per-Hop-Behavior
draft-ietf-tsvwg-le-phb-02

Roland Bless,

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT)

bless@kit.edu

Changes draft...-01 → -02

- Applied many editorial suggestions from David Black
- Clarified what is required for deployment in section 1.2 (Deployment Considerations)
- Updated IANA section according to David Black's suggestions
- Added Multicast traffic use case
- Added text about implementations using AQMs and ECN usage
- Revised text in the security section

„No Harm" to BE traffic

- Without LE support a provider cannot take advantage of this feature
  - Must be aware in case LE traffic is carried within BE aggregate
- Two types of users
  - **LE-min** = better treatment allowed
    - do not remark as BE
  - **LE-strict** = better treatment NOT allowed
    - only transmit if resources otherwise unused (wants to assure no harm property)
    - in case of elevated service: better remark to BE for detection?
    - alternatively: use LE-min + LE transport (e.g., LEDBAT)
  - Detection of LE remarking (DSCP feedback): how?

Next Steps

- Usefulness of LE-min / LE-strict?
  - Do we need two DSCPs to explicitly detect LE elevation?

- Fix DSCP choice
  - suggested 000010 (DSCP= 2)
  - removes ambiguity
  - should not be bleached in case upper bits are cleared (IP precedence), so 000xx0 remain as potential choices in DSCP standard pool
  - more feedback from measurements/experiments

- Reviews and feedback appreciated

- Ready for WG last call?