



Ack Frequency

[draft-ietf-quic-ack-frequency](https://github.com/quicwg/ack-frequency)

<https://github.com/quicwg/ack-frequency>

QUIC WG, Philadelphia, July 2022

Current Frame Formats

```
ACK_FREQUENCY Frame {  
    Type (i) = 0xaf,  
    Sequence Number (i),  
    Ack-Eliciting Threshold (i),  
    Request Max Ack Delay (i),  
    Reserved (6),  
    Ignore CE (1),  
    Ignore Order (1)  
}
```

```
IMMEDIATE_ACK Frame {  
    Type (i) = 0xaf  
}
```

Sequence Number: Allows receivers to ignore obsolete frames after reordering.

Ack-Eliciting Threshold: The maximum number of ack-eliciting packets the recipient of this frame can receive before sending an acknowledgment.

Request Max Ack Delay: The value to which the endpoint requests the peer update its max_ack_delay

Ignore CE: This field is set to true by an endpoint that does not wish to receive an immediate acknowledgement when the peer receives CE-marked packets.

Ignore Order: This field is set to true by an endpoint that does not wish to receive an immediate acknowledgement when the peer receives a packet out of order.

IMMEDIATE_ACK 1 byte frame type? ([#119](#))

Issue: Currently its `0xac`. It's likely to be sent quite often, should we switch to a 1 byte codepoint? Particularly given we may want to bundle IMMEDIATE_ACK with PTO packets.

Question: Should we switch to 1 byte?

Is Ignore CE Useful? ([#118](#))

Issue: Unclear if Ignore CE is really useful, and a number of concerns were expressed on [#87](#) and [#107](#).

PR [#116](#) added: *"Ignore-CE bit SHOULD NOT be set if the sender sets ECT(1) in its outgoing packets, such as with L4S"*

Question: Is Ignore CE worth keeping?

Examples or Suggestions of use? ([#53](#))

Status Quo: PR [#115](#) Attempts to update the Congestion Control section, but isn't proscriptive and doesn't have examples.

Questions:

Should examples of use be included?

If so, what?

Should there be suggestions of use?

Particularly for Reno/Cubic?

Latency to detect packet loss? ([#96](#))

Issue: One ACK is sent immediately upon a missing packet. But after that, the next ACK will not be sent until there are more missing packets or the `Ack-Eliciting Threshold` or `max_ack_delay` are hit.

Result: Loss detection delayed when `Ack-Eliciting Threshold` is larger than the `Packet Threshold`.

Can't detect loss immediately with the immediate ACK

Loss detection latency is worse than QUIC v1 when $\text{Ack-Eliciting Threshold} > 2$

Latency to detect packet loss? ([#96](#))

Proposal ([#100](#)):

Communicate `Reordering Threshold` to receiver
instead of `Ignore Order`

Receiver immediately ACKs when missing packets in:

```
[largest_acknowledged_sent - Reordering Threshold,  
largest_acknowledged - Reordering Threshold]
```

Result: Receiver reduces ACKs when packets received out of order while improving loss detection latency over QUIC v1