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Problem #1

- RFC6040 “Tunnelling of ECN”; scope was all IP-in-IP tunnels
- rfc6040update-shim clarifies that scope of RFC6040 includes cases with shim
  - most feasible to propagate ECN if shim 'tightly coupled' (added in same step as IP outer)

- Standards track, so it can update standards track RFC6040 and shim tunnel RFCs
Problem #2: unique to ECN

- Both Diffserv (traffic class) and ECN have to propagate across layers
  - DS propagates 'requirements' down
  - ECN propagates...
    - ECN field down (copy)
    - congestion experienced (CE) up
- forwarded ECN constructed from inner and outer on decap [RFC6040]
- If ECN decap behaviour absent, encap MUST zero ECN outer
## Survey of IP-shim-(L2)-IP encaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol</th>
<th>RFC</th>
<th>STDs or widely deployed</th>
<th>AOK</th>
<th>NOK: 6040 shim updates</th>
<th>NOK: non-IETF: update recom’n’d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geneve</td>
<td>nvo3-geneve</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUE</td>
<td>intarea-gue</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC</td>
<td>7665</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VXLAN</td>
<td>7348</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VXLAN-GPE</td>
<td>nvo3-vxlan-gpe</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISP</td>
<td>6830</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPWAP</td>
<td>5415</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teredo</td>
<td>4380</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTP</td>
<td>v1, v1U, v2C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVGRE</td>
<td>7637</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIP4</td>
<td>5944</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIP6</td>
<td>6275</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMIP</td>
<td>5845</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2TPv3</td>
<td>3931</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2TPv2</td>
<td>2661</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPTP</td>
<td>2637</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP</td>
<td>8085</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT</td>
<td>7450</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP+IKE/IPsec</td>
<td>8229</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why update some protocols but not others?

- In all cases, each base protocol RFC has been updated with an “operator safe configuration” clause
  - Places ref to ECN problem and solution in “Updated by” header

- Protocol Spec:

  ```
  if ( ( a maintainer of the protocol could be found) 
      && (it seemed like code might get updated) 
      && (I was confident I knew the implications of the update) )
      {I proposed fix to the control plane protocol, iterated, done}
  else
  ```
Updates to standards track tunnel RFCs added this IETF cycle

- **AMT (Automatic Multicast Tunnelling)**
  - Updates to RFC 7450:
    - defined new flag on Request message for gateway to declare its ECN capability to the relay that will tunnel towards it (unidirectional)
    - Operator required to follow safe config in present spec
  - ACK: Jake Holland

- **GRE (Generic Routing Encapsulation)**
  - Update to RFC2784:
    - Operator required to follow safe config in present spec
  - Referred to (but not updated) 4 control protocols that are known to set up GRE tunnels
    - MIP4, MIP6, PMIP, IKEv2
  - ACK: Sri Gundavelli
Status and Next Steps
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• Rev posted this morning (sorry)
• Milestone: WGLC Sep 2017
• Been pushing to meet that, ready now - not so late

• Corridor chat this week might lead to updates to outstanding protocols (Teredo, (P)MIP)
  • Assume not
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Q&A
Compliance requirement for non-RFC6040 implementations!

- Written as an operator config requirement
  - if decap does not, or might not, propagate ECN to RFC 6040 (or equiv), if possible, the operator MUST configure the ingress to zero the outer ECN field

- Prerequisite implementation requirement
  - Config of ECN encap MUST be independent from DSCP encap

- Added text updates RFC 6040, and shim tunnel RFCs