# Congestion Control for DCCP

Nathalie Romo Moreno, CCWG @IETF117



# **Congestion Control for DCCP**

#### **Motivation**

Application for Multipath DCCP

### **Current Status**

Congestion control algorithms currently standardized and part of the Linux kernel implementation for DCCP

- Congestion Control ID 2 RFC4341 : TCP-like Congestion Control Based on RFC793, RFC2581, RFC3465, and RFC3517
- Congestion Control ID 3 RFC4342: TCP-Friendly Rate Control (TFRC), based on RFC3448
- Congestion Control ID 4 RFC5622: TCP-Friendly Rate Control for Small Packets (Experimental), based on RFC 4828

# **New CCIDs implementations for Linux Kernel (out of tree)**

Congestion Control ID 5-> Based on BBRv1

https://github.com/telekom/mpdccp/blob/mpdccp\_v03\_k5.10/net/dccp/ccids/ccid5.c

Congestion Control ID 6-> Based on BBRv2

https://github.com/telekom/mpdccp/blob/mpdccp\_v03\_k5.10/net/dccp/ccids/ccid6.c

Congestion Control ID 7-> Based on Cubic

https://github.com/telekom/mpdccp/blob/mpdccp\_v03\_k5.10/net/dccp/ccids/ccid7.c



# **Congestion Control for DCCP**

# **Target**

Standardize BBR and CUBIC TCP Congestion Control algorithms as new CCID (Congestion Control ID) profiles for DCCP

## Work done

Individual draft for CCID5 (an implementation of BBRv1) at ICCRG <a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-romo-iccrg-ccid5">https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-romo-iccrg-ccid5</a> (Expired)

#### How to move forward?

- Does the standardization of a BBR-based CCID requires to have BBR standardized as an RFC? What are the alternatives?
- Would it be possible to have different CCID profiles for BBRv1 and BBRv2?
  Existing individual draft for BBR <a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-cardwell-iccrg-bbr-congestion-control">https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-cardwell-iccrg-bbr-congestion-control</a> started as a specification of BBRv1, current version specifies BBRv2
- CUBIC RFC is informational, is it possible to have a CCID profile that references it?

