

Datagram Congestion Control (DCCP)

Design Review (a new thing)

Pointers

- ❁ **All slides are available at**

- <http://www.icir.org/kohler/dccp/ietf57>

- ❁ **Mailing list:**

- <http://www1.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/dccp>

Meeting Format & Ground Rules

Or, how does this thing work?

Background

- ❖ **DCCP spec is settling, but not finished**
- ❖ **Written review of spec (nearly) completed on mailing list**
- ❖ **Implementations happening this summer**
- ❖ **Plan WGLC this fall**
- ❖ **We probably should have had this review a little earlier**
 - **But it's not too late to make significant changes**

What are we doing?

- ❖ **This is a technical design review**
- ❖ **Want to surface issues from a cross-disciplinary audience**

Look for

- ❖ **Faulty assumptions**
 - Particularly in apps/upper layers
- ❖ **Poor design decisions**
- ❖ **Unnecessary functions or complexity**
- ❖ **Implementation, deployment risks**

Design Review Agenda

❁ Meeting Objectives & Rules	5 min
❁ Charter Review	5 min
❁ Spec Review	40 min
❁ <i>Expert Reviewer Comments</i>	10 min
❁ Discussion	45 min
❁ Reviewer Feedback	10 min
❁ Closeout – Next steps	5 min

Who's Who?

- ❖ **Several roles interplay**
- ❖ **Quick definitions follow**

Running the meeting

❁ **WG chair (Aaron) & AD (Allison)**

- Tracking time
- Monitoring process
- Making sure comments are heard and captured

Presenting the spec

❁ **Spec authors (Eddie assisted by Sally & Mark)**

- Giving quick run-through of the spec for non-experts
- Clarifying intent

Design Reviewers

- ✿ **Magnus Westerlund (*multimedia*)**
- ✿ **Steve Bellovin (*security*)**
- ✿ **Rob Austein (*architecture*)**
 - Evaluating spec
 - Considering feedback from room
 - Making (written & verbal) recommendation:
What must be done for the spec to proceed?

Expert Reviewers

- ✿ **Greg Minshall** (*transport*)
- ✿ **Eric Rescorla** (*security*)
- ✿ **Jonathan Rosenberg** (*multimedia*)
 - Conducting detailed written spec review
(sent to list)

The Room

✿ **You**

- Provide feedback on protocol
- Is it clear?
- Is it implementable?

Meeting Scope

❁ **In Scope**

- Questions of clarification
- Suggestions of error, poor design choice

❁ **Out of Scope**

- WG charter
- Problem statement, e.g., macro goals of the protocol

Ground Rules

- ❁ **Only reviewers ask questions during spec walkthrough**
 - in the interest of time
- ❁ **If you raise a substantive issue, please follow-up with a short note to the list**
 - to ensure correct capture of name & issue
- ❁ **If you think an issue is a showstopper, say so**
 - note it, don't fix it in this meeting

Design Review Agenda

❁ Meeting Objectives & Rules	5 min
❁ Charter Review	5 min
❁ Spec Review	40 min
❁ <i>Expert Reviewer Comments</i>	10 min
❁ Discussion	45 min
❁ Reviewer Feedback	10 min
❁ Closeout – Next steps	5 min

DCCP Charter Review

What are we trying to accomplish?

Protocol Objectives

- ❁ **Establishment, teardown & maintenance of un-reliable packet flow**
- ❁ **Congestion control for that flow**

Charter Guidance

- ❖ **Minimize packet overhead**
- ❖ **Be simple, avoid unnecessary higher layer functions**
- ❖ **Enable other functions to be layered on top**

Scope

- ❁ **IPv4 and IPv6**
- ❁ **Non-cryptographic mechanisms for DoS protection**
- ❁ **Multi-homing/Mobility**

Deliverables

- ❁ **Publish Protocol and CCID Spec as Standards-track RFCs**
- ❁ **Publish Example API as Informational RFC**

WG Schedule

- ✿ **6/03** **expert review for spec**
- ✿ **6-8/03** **implementations**
- ✿ **ietf-57** **spec design review**
- ✿ **9-11/03** **incorporate review and implementation
feedback into spec**
- ✿ **10/03** **collaborate with avt wg on API**
- ✿ **ietf-58** **prepare for wg last call**
- ✿ **11/03** **wg last call for spec, CCIDs**
- ✿ **12/03** **wg last call on API**

Design Review Agenda

❁ Meeting Objectives & Rules	5 min
❁ Charter Review	5 min
❁ Spec Review	40 min
❁ <i>Expert Reviewer Comments</i>	10 min
❁ Discussion	45 min
❁ Reviewer Feedback	10 min
❁ Closeout – Next steps	5 min