

# PCN

Congestion and Pre-congestion Notification

IETF 72 - Dublin  
Thursday 2008-07-31

# Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- the IETF plenary session,
- any IETF working group or portion thereof,
- the IESG or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG,
- the IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB,
- any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices,
- the RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 3978 (updated by RFC 4748) and RFC 3979(updated by RFC 4879).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice.

Please consult RFC 3978 (and RFC 4748) for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

# Administrivia (1)

- Chairs:
  - Scott Bradner <[sob@harvard.edu](mailto:sob@harvard.edu)>
  - Steven Blake <[slblake@petri-meat.com](mailto:slblake@petri-meat.com)>
- Mailing list:
  - <[pcn@ietf.org](mailto:pcn@ietf.org)>
  - <http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/pcn/index.html>
- PCN homepage:
  - <http://www.ietf.org/html.charters/pcn-charter.html>
- Meeting materials:
  - <https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/72/materials.html>

# Administrivia (2)

- Blue sheets
- Note takers
- Jabber scribe
  - [pcn@jabber.ietf.org](mailto:pcn@jabber.ietf.org)
- Agenda bash

# Agenda

- 10 min chairs Administrivia
- 15 min chairs Discuss ITU-T Liaison Statement
- 50 min Eardley Pre-Congestion Notification Architecture  
[draft-eardley-pcn-architecture-04](#)  
Marking Behavior of PCN Nodes  
[draft-eardley-pcn-marking-behavior-01](#)
- 30 min Moncaster Baseline Encoding for PCN  
[draft-moncaster-pcn-baseline-encoding-02](#)  
3 State Encoding for PCN  
[draft-moncaster-pcn-3-state-encoding-00](#)  
Multiple PCN Experiments
- 20 min Babiarz PCN Encoding for Packet-Specific Dual Marking  
[draft-menth-pcn-psdm-encoding-00](#)  
End-to-End Extension for PCN Encoding  
[draft-menth-pcn-e2e-encoding-00](#)
- 10 min Briscoe Layered Encapsulation of Congestion Notification  
[draft-briscoe-tsvwg-ecn-tunnel-01](#)
- 15 min Mekkes LC-PCN  
[draft-westberg-pcn-load-control-04](#)

# Goals and Milestones (1)

- Nov 2007: Submit "Flow Admission and Termination Architecture within a Diffserv Domain" (Informational)
- Nov 2007: Submit "Survey of Encoding and Transport Choices of (Pre-)Congestion Information within a Diffserv Domain" (Informational)
- Mar 2008: Submit "(Pre-)Congestion Detection within a Diffserv Domain" (Proposed)
- Mar 2008: Submit "Requirements for Signaling of (Pre-)Congestion Information from Egress to Ingress in a Diffserv Domain" (Informational)
- Jul 2008: Submit "Encoding and Transport of (Pre-)Congestion Information from within a Diffserv Domain to the Egress" (Proposed)

# Goals and Milestones (2)

- Jul 2008: Submit “Suggested Flow Admission and Termination Boundary Mechanisms” (Informational)
- Nov 2008: Submit “Encoding and Transport of (Pre-) Congestion Information from the Domain Egress to the Ingress” (Proposed)

Where are we?

**Behind schedule**



# Consensus calls since IETF 71 (1)

1. As an initial standardization activity, should the PCN wg produce a standards-track PCN scheme that requires only two encoding states? (Note: this question does not presume that the solution is Single Marking).

**YES**

2. Presuming consensus in favor of Q1, should the PCN wg produce one or more experimental-track extensions to the standards-track PCN scheme that require another encoding state (for a total of three encoding states)?

**YES**

3. Does the PCN working group have enough information to make a decision about the way forward for the standards-track PCN scheme?

**YES**

# Consensus calls since IETF 71 (2)

4. Should the standards-track PCN scheme require (as a MUST implement feature) that interior PCN routers support Excess-Rate marking, according to the particular method of handling already marked packets and drops described in Anna Charny's presentation?  
<http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/08mar/slides/pcn-6.pdf>

**YES**

5. Should the standards-track PCN scheme require (as a MUST implement feature) that interior PCN routers support Threshold marking (in addition to Excess-Rate marking), according to the particular method described in Philip Eardley's presentation on Tuesday?  
<http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/08mar/slides/pcn-4.pdf>

**YES**

6. If presented with sufficient evidence in a timely fashion, would the PCN wg entertain the option of modifying the interior router Excess-Rate marking behavior for the standards-track PCN scheme (as described in question 4)?

**NO CONSENSUS**

# ITU-T Liaison on Q.PCNAApp

- <https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/461/>
- Who has read it?
- Any comments?
- Response back to ITU-T requested by 2008-09-01.