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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?