

Encoding 3 PCN-States in the IP header using a single DSCP

[draft-ietf-pcn-3-in-1-encoding-06.txt](#)

Bob Briscoe, BT
Toby Moncaster, independent
Michael Menth, Uni Tuebingen
IETF-81 PCN Jul 2011



status

Glossary

NM = Not Marked

ThM = Threshold Marked

ETM = Excess Traffic Marked

SM = single marking

PSDM = packet-specific dual marking

- Encoding 3 PCN-States in the IP header using a single DSCP
 - **mature draft:** [draft-ietf-pcn-3-in-1-encoding-06.txt](#)
 - **dependency:** RFC6040 (PS) not required but preferred
 - **intended status:** standards track
 - **exec summary:** rewritten to obsolete not just update RFC5696
 - superset of SM in baseline, but threshold marker cannot set 11
 - could not also accommodate PSDM
 - **immediate intent:** Summarise ML discussions. Another WGLC
 - 06bis written to fix some nits, but can process with WGLC

	DSCP	00	10	01	11
Baseline RFC 5696	DSCPn	Not-PCN	NM	EXP	PM
3-in-1	DSCPn	Not-PCN	NM	ThM	ETM

3-in-1 encoding rewritten

- in order to obsolete, not just update, baseline [RFC5696]
 - 3-in-1 has become superset of 3-in-1 and single marking in baseline
 - re-written not just pasted – clean text
- clarified applicability
 - particularly with respect to RFC6040 and pre-RFC6040 tunnels
- added section on backward compatibility with baseline
- imported relevant informative appendices from RFC5696 to 3-in-1
 - Appendix A. Choice of Suitable DSCPs 17
 - Appendix B. Co-existence of ECN and PCN 18
 - Appendix C. Example Mapping between Encoding of PCN-Marks in
IP and in MPLS Shim Headers 21

Summary of mailing list discussions

- in order to obsolete, not just update, baseline encoding [RFC5696]
 - 3-in-1 has become superset of 3-in-1 and single marking in baseline
- Cases where only one marking function throughout PCN domain
 - Only Excess-traffic-marking: (e.g. single-marking) straightforward
 - Only Threshold-marking: issues with pre-6040 tunnels (next slide)
- Could not accommodate PSDM
 - too many differences
 - has to continue on experimental track as alternate to 3-in-1
- tunnel half in a PCN-domain
 - problem with RFC5559 text. Fix in 3-in-1? Or erratum to 5559?

Threshold Marked (ThM) and pre-6040 tunnels

- 11 codepoint has become solely excess-traffic-marked (ETM)
 - no longer generic ‘PCN-marked’ (PM, ie ETM or ThM) codepoint
 - **ThM now defined, but MUST NOT use unless all tunnel endpoints are RFC6040**
 - a pre-6040 tunnel egress conflicts with using ThM (reverts to NM on decap)


Summary of mailing list discussion that led to this decision...

We want to define cases where pre-6040 tunnel endpoints can be used

- Easy cases:
 - if only excess-traffic-marking throughout domain (e.g. single-marking - SM)
 - just works with any tunnels
 - if both marking functions running (e.g. controlled load - CL)
 - all tunnel endpoints in PCN domain MUST comply with RFC6040
- Harder case: if only threshold marking throughout domain (no example use-cases)
 - We had two possibilities to choose between:
 1. threshold marking sets ThM but only in a pure 6040 PCN domain
 2. If pre-6040 tunnel endpoints present, allow ThM to set 11
 - Given no use-case, decided not to allow case #2 (avoids confusion)

	DSCP	00	10	01	11
Baseline RFC 5696	DSCPn	Not-PCN	NM	EXP	PM
3-in-1	DSCPn	Not-PCN	NM	ThM	ETM

tunnel half in a PCN-domain



- in this case, PCN arch [RFC5559] incorrectly says

the tunnel egress node clears any PCN-marking on the inner header. This rule is applied before the "copy on decapsulation" rule above

- incorrect: would break e2e ECN by wiping CE on inner
- where to fix this
 - 3-in-1 appendix on interaction between e2e ECN and PCN
 - Erratum to RFC5559?

Encoding 3 PCN-States in the IP header using a single DSCP

[draft-ietf-pcn-3-in-1-encoding-06.txt](#)

Q&A

