

Shepherd Update on L4S Drafts

Wes Eddy <wes@mti-systems.com>

Last Call Status

- Expecting one more revision of drafts.
 - Very few things still being discussed.
- Believe all comments have been understood and considered by the WG.
- Believe editors have made agreed changes suggested.
 - Please confirm and ACK.
- Strong support to publish.
- But the consensus is “rough”:
 - Some specific items are not agreed.
 - E.g. should this be Standards Track and obsolete 3168?
 - In general:
 - Some disagree entirely with the L4S approach.

Planning to submit to AD fairly soon after next revision is posted.

Draft Shepherd Writeups

- <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-tsvwg-l4s-arch/shepherdwriteup/>
- <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-tsvwg-ecn-l4s-id/shepherdwriteup/>
- <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-tsvwg-aqm-dualq-coupled/shepherdwriteup/>
- Question (9) in each is intended to capture the essence of the “roughness”.
- These are a first attempt.
- Accepting comments/clarifications/etc. – private ok, if you prefer.

Open Discussion Items?

- Please confirm the updates look good w/ regard to 4774 compliance
 - Specifically section 4.3.1 of draft-ietf-tsvwg-ecn-l4s-id-24.
- Tunnel DoS vector
 - Done based on anti-replay discussion in 6.2 of draft-ietf-tsvwg-ecn-l4s-id?
- Non-L4S traffic abusing the L-queue
 - *'DualQ gives a large throughput bonus to L queue traffic, ie. a "fast lane"'*
 - Is this a matter specific for DualQ that can be left for experimentation?