PCN architecture & marking behaviour

Philip Eardley

IETF-72, Dublin, 31st July 2008

Draft-ietf-pcn-architecture-04

- Summary
  - No technical open issues
  - Rev ASAP with a few nits, clarifications…
  - Ready for WG Last Call
- Changes
  - to reflect consensus decisions on marking behaviour (at Philadelphia)
  - to reflect that current encoding has a STDS baseline proposal & then EXP extension(s)
  - Restructuring of Introduction to improve clarity
  - Added section about Backwards compatibility (RFC4774)

Draft-eardley-pcn-marking-behaviour-01

- Summary
  - Request to make this a WG doc
  - Rev needed, but the basics are mature
- Changes from 00 to 01
  - to reflect consensus decisions on marking behaviour (at Philadelphia)
  - to reflect that current encoding has a STDS baseline proposal & then EXP extension(s)
  - (Traffic conditioning – to be changed again)
- Changes planned for 02 (WG-00)
  - Traffic conditioning – simplify
  - Make it purely PHB
  - Threshold & excess rate marking both MUSTs?

Traffic conditioning on PCN-interior-nodes

- PCN-traffic:
  - Drop pkts (queue overflows) &/or flow termination
  - Per hop Policing not needed
- Non-PCN-traffic
  - ie shares the same capacity as PCN (at same or higher priority), maybe not admission controlled
  - “The goal of PCN is to keep PCN traffic within some bandwidth on a link. If the bandwidth is also used for something else, this presents dangers & there must be a mechanism to limit it. How to do this is out of scope of PCN: see DiffServ docs & ieft-tsvwg-admitted-realtime-dscp”
  - Appendix discuss this a bit, eg 2 cases:
    - PCN & non-PCN share queue: MUST police non-PCN
    - PCN & non-PCN separate queues: MUST police non-PCN

PHB

- This document is about PCN-interior-node PHB
- PDB stuff: create a new doc, covering eg
  - Traffic conditioning on PCN-ingress-nodes
  - Whole PCN-domain things
  - how use PHB stuff in a PCN-domain

Both marking behaviours MUSTs?

- Should they both be MUSTs to do?
  - silly
- Should they both be MUSTs to implement?
  - +: migration easier
- Should they be a conditional MUST?
  - If you do threshold-marking, MUST do x
  - If you do excess-traffic-marking, MUST do y
  - +: implementation easier