

# **Issues for draft-ietf- diffserv-pdb-00**

Pittsburgh, PA, USA  
July 31, 2000

“Definition of Differentiated Services  
Per-Domain Behaviors and Rules for  
their Specification”

Kathleen Nichols  
nichols@packetdesign.com

Brian Carpenter  
brian@icair.org

# Notes

- This is an update with terminology change of draft-ietf-diffserv-ba-def, so see the slides/notes from the last IETF meeting if you are new to this

# Issues

- hyphenate (consistently) per-domain (also per-hop)

okay, this agrees with authors' intent. will do.

- edit document, be consistent with diffserv terms

again, this is certainly the authors' intent. Editing input is welcome.

## Disagreements, etc. about goals of the document

- Dan Grossman would have liked an "applicability statement" for diffserv or something that clears up everyone's confusion about diffserv
  - isn't/wasn't our intent. Perhaps some of the diffserv books would be useful?
  - diffserv **is** still different things to different people
  - getting some basic queuing, classification, and traffic conditioning capabilities into routers was the first goal of this WG
  - lots of ways these can be useful now, but seems like a great black hole of controversy for us to try to define a grand unified theory of diffserv at this point.
  - we think that the next year or so will see a lot of use of parts of diffserv and this will make it much easier to write about applicability in the future; at this point, it's another tool available to those who need it
  - discussion?

- Dan Grossman wants the draft to say explicitly that PDBs are edge-to-edge services
  - a lot of discussion is the document about edge-to-edge and PDBs and the relationship to Services
  - The definition in the draft: “Per-Domain Behavior: the expected treatment that an identifiable or target group of packets will receive from “edge to edge” of a DS domain. (Also PDB). A particular PHB (or, if applicable, list of PHBs) and traffic conditioning requirements are associated with each PDB.”
  - discussion?
- should the reference PDBs be in here?
  - should we have them?
  - should they be elsewhere?
  - are these right/wrong?

- standards track vs informational

WG co-chairs (and AD) feel either info or exp or even BCPs

- this seemed to be the path at Adelaide. Is this incorrect?

- PDBs are more of an advisory nature...might be thought of as experimental,

- i.e., we'll go off and experiment against some of these and perhaps have reports of experience

- How to deal with PDBs that use PHB groups?

What we said (in section 4.3) was that “When a set of related PDBs are defined using a PHB group, they should be defined in the same document.” It appears that we neglected to state clearly our belief that “When unrelated PDBs are defined using a PHB group, they should be defined in different documents”. But we did say: “If it makes sense to specify them in the same document, then the author(s) should do so.”

- Add a requirement for a deployment (can be less than a service offering, but must be more than a lab experiment)?