Reminder of background

- Have to encode either:
  - 2 codepoint solutions: SM, LC without Aff.M, CL with only one marking
  - 3 codepoint solutions: 3SM, CL, LC with Aff.M
- Proposal is to standardise a 2 codepoint encoding soution
- Simultaneously produce an experimental extension scheme providing for a 3 codepoint solution
- Limitations:
  - Use minimum number of DSCPs
  - Avoid interactions with tunnels
  - Comply with relevant RFCs

Encoding Proposals

Terminology:

NM = Not Marked

NM(*xx*) = Not Marked with ECN codepoint *xx* e.g. NM(CE)

ThM = Threshold Marked

EM = Excess-rate Marked

Proposed Standard Encoding

ECN / DSCP	Not-ECT	ECT	CE
VOICE-ADMIT*	Not PCN	NM	EM

Proposed Experimental Extension Encoding

ECN / DSCP	Not-ECT	ECT	CE
VOICE-ADMIT*	Not-PCN	NM(ECT)	EM
DSCPx	NM(Not-ECT)	NM(CE)	ThM

* see draft-ietf-tsvwg-admitted-realtime-dscp-03

Consensus Questions

1. Can you live with only standardising a 2 codepoint solution?

2. Do you agree that we should produce a 3 codepoint solution as an experimental extension?

Supplementary Consensus Question

1. Which of the following options do you prefer:

    a. ONLY standardise a 2 codepoint solution with NO extensions allowed

    b. Standardise a 2 codepoint solution with a 3 codepoint solution as an experimental extension

    c. ONLY standardise a 3 codepoint solution