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What’s the Problem?

- Internet gives all flows the same “best effort” service
  - no promises about when or whether packets will be delivered
- Not all traffic is created equal
  - different “owners”, different application requirements
  - some applications require service “assurances”
- How can we give traffic different “quality of service”?  
  - Thus begins the problem of QoS
Three Basic Problems

- Want to control how a link is shared:
  - Link sharing
- Want to give some traffic better service
  - Differentiated service
- Want to give some flows “assured” service
  - Integrated service (and perhaps differentiated service)
Link Sharing

• First approach suggested by Nagle (1987)
• Round-robin among different flows
  – one queue per flow
Round-Robin Discussion

• Advantages: protection among flows
  – Misbehaving flows will not affect the performance of well-behaving flows
    • Misbehaving flow – a flow that does not implement any congestion control
  – FIFO does not have such a property

• Disadvantages:
  – More complex than FIFO: per flow queue/state
  – Biased toward large packets – a flow receives service proportional to the number of packets
Solution?

• Bit-by-bit round robin
• Can you do this in practice?
• No, packets cannot be preempted (why?)
• ...we can only approximate it
Fair Queueing (FQ)

- Define a **fluid flow** system: a system in which flows are served bit-by-bit
- Then serve packets in the increasing order of their deadlines
- Advantages
  - Each flow will receive exactly its fair rate
- Note:
  - FQ achieves max-min fairness
Max-Min Fairness

- **Denote**
  - $C$ – link capacity
  - $N$ – number of flows
  - $r_i$ – arrival rate
- **Max-min fair rate computation:**
  1. compute $C/N$
  2. if there are flows $i$ such that $r_i \leq C/N$, update $C$ and $N$
  3. if no, $f = C/N$; terminate
  4. go to 1
- A flow can receive at most the fair rate, i.e., $\min(f, r_i)$
Example

- $C = 10; \ r_1 = 8, \ r_2 = 6, \ r_3 = 2; \ N = 3$
- $C/3 = 3.33 \Rightarrow C = C - r_3 = 8; \ N = 2$
- $C/2 = 4; \ f = 4$

$f = 4: \quad$
- $\min(8, 4) = 4$
- $\min(6, 4) = 4$
- $\min(2, 4) = 2$
Implementing Fair Queueing

- Idea: serve packets in the order in which they would have finished transmission in the fluid flow system
Example

Flow 1
(arrival traffic)

Flow 2
(arrival traffic)

Service
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Packet
system
FQ Advantages

- FQ protect well-behaved flows from ill-behaved flows
- Example: 1 UDP (10 Mbps) and 31 TCP’s sharing a 10 Mbps link
• FQ does not eliminate congestion → it just manages the congestion
• You need both end-host congestion control and router support for congestion control
  – end-host congestion control to adapt
  – router congestion control to protect/isolate
Three Basic QoS Questions

• How does a router service this packet?
  – scheduling (various forms of priority and RR)
  – dropping (fancy versions of RED)
• How did the router know what to do with this packet?
  – bits in packet header or explicit signaling
• How can one control the level of traffic?
  – service level agreements (SLAs) or admission control
Integrated Services

• An attempt to integrate service for “real-time” applications into the Internet
• Known as IntServ
• A total, massive, and humiliating failure
  – 1000s of papers
  – IETF standards
  – and no deployment....
Key Differences

- All assurances on per-flow basis
- Traffic can be turned away
- Note:
  - all this co-exists with best-effort service
  - similar mechanisms proposed for ATM but
    • QoS central in ATM, best-effort an afterthought
    • Best-effort central in Internet, QoS an afterthought
Example: Video

Simplify by assuming that Camera sends at a fixed rate
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Circuit-Switched Networks

- Each packet experiences exactly the same delay
- Packet data is displayed as soon as it arrives
- Signal at receiving end is faithful representation
Internet

• Individual packets experience different delays

• Can’t treat network as “wire”

• Application must adapt to network service
Router Effect on Delay

Prob vs. Delay/latency

- Min
- e.g. 30ms
- 99%

Delay variation
or
Jitter
Router Effects on Traffic

![Graph showing cumulative bits over time with delays and router effects]
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Network Effects on Traffic

**Diagram Description:**
- **Cumulative Bits** vs. **Time** graph showing the flow of bits over time.
- **Source** begins the cumulative bits.
- **Delay** indicated by the time it takes for bits to travel through the network.
- **Router n** indicates the end of the network path.
Network Effect on Delay
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Choices

- Play back data upon arrival
  - distorted signal
- Buffer data for a while (playback buffer)
  - extra delay, less distortion
- Tradeoff depends on application (and use)
  - noninteractive: absorb delay, eliminate all distortion
  - interactive: absorb only a little delay, eliminate some distortion
Playback Buffer

Play back data a fixed time interval after it was sent
Playback Point
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Adaptation

• Can move playback point as delays vary

• Moving playback point:
  – increases distortion
  – but allows lower delays
Application Taxonomy (Oversimplified and Fanciful)

- Elastic versus “real-time”
  - traditional data apps are elastic
  - streaming media are real-time
- RT intolerant versus RT tolerant
  - intolerant applications need all data
- Tolerant nonadaptive versus tolerant adaptive
  - not clear why any tolerant app couldn’t adapt
- Rate-adaptive versus delay-adaptive (or both)
Key Points

- Some apps don’t need to know maximal delay, just need it to be controlled
  - tolerant, delay-adaptive applications will move playback point to reduce delay
  - can absorb occasional outliers
- Some apps need to know maximal delay
  - can’t tolerate loss or distortion
  - need to fix playback point and so need a priori knowledge of delay bound
  - bound is typically much worse than actual delays
Two Service Classes

• Controlled Load
  – keep delays under control, but no bound

• Guaranteed Service
  – explicit delay bound
Process

- Flow requests service from network
  - service request specification (RSpec)
    - controlled load: nothing
    - guaranteed: service rate (can calculate delay)
  - traffic specification (TSpec) (next slide)
- Routers decide if they can support request
  - admission control
- If so, traffic is classified and scheduled at routers based on per-flow information
Problem

- How do you describe bursty traffic?
- Network needs some description of traffic
- But video source is bursty (due to coding)
  - can’t predict in advance the exact behavior
- Describe “envelope” of traffic: rate and burstiness
- Bits sent between times s and t: \( A(s,t) \leq \sigma + \rho(t-s) \)
TSpec: The Token Bucket

ρ: average rate
σ: burstiness

Bits sent between times s and t: \( A(s,t) \leq \sigma + \rho(t-s) \)

Nick Mckeown
CS 349/Fall06
Required Elements

• Reservation Protocol
  – how service request gets from host to network

• Admission control algorithm
  – how network decides if it can accept flow

• Packet scheduling algorithms (next lecture)
  – so routers can deliver service
Control Plane versus Data Plane

• Plane as in geometry, not airplane

• Control plane:
  – how information gets to routers

• Data plane:
  – what routers do with that information to data packets
Control Plane: Resource Reservation
Control Plane: Resource Reservation

Sender sends Tspec
Control Plane: Resource Reservation
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Control Plane: Admission Control
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Data Plane

Per-flow classification on each router
Data Plane

Per-flow classification on each router
Data Plane

Per-flow scheduling on each router
Resource Reservation Protocol: RSVP

- Establishes end-to-end reservations over a datagram network
- Designed for multicast (which will be covered later in course).

- Sources: send TSpec
- Receivers: respond with RSpec Network
- Network: responds to reservation requests
PATH and RESV Messages

- Sender sends PATH messages
  - TSPEC: use token bucket
  - Set up the path state on each router including the address of previous hop (route pinning)
  - Collect path information (for guaranteed service)
- Receiver sends RESV message on the reverse path
  - Specify RSpec and TSpec
  - Sets up the reservation state at each router
The Big Picture
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Soft State

- Per session state has a timer associated with it
  - Path state, reservation state
- State deleted when timer expires
- Sender/Receiver periodically refreshes the state, resends PATH/RESV messages, resets timer
- Advantages:
  - No need to clean up dangling state after failure
  - Can tolerate lost signaling packets
  - Easy to adapt to route changes
Route Pinning

- **Problem:** asymmetric routes
  - You may reserve resources on $R \rightarrow S_3 \rightarrow S_5 \rightarrow S_4 \rightarrow S_1 \rightarrow S$, but data travels on $S \rightarrow S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rightarrow S_3 \rightarrow R$!

- **Solution:** use PATH to remember direct path from $S$ to $R$, i.e., perform route pinning
Admission Control

- Parameter-based: worst cast analysis
  - guaranteed service
  - low utilization
- Measurement-based: measure current traffic
  - controlled load service
  - higher utilization
- Remember that best-effort service co-exists
  - no need for IntServ traffic to achieve high utilization
IntServ Node Architecture
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Advantages of IntServ

- Precise QoS delivered at flow granularities
  - good service, given exactly to who needs it

- Decisions made by hosts
  - who know what they need
  - not by organizations, egress/ingress points, etc.

- Fits multicast and unicast traffic equally well
Disadvantages of IntServ

- Scalability: per-flow state, classification, etc.
  - we goofed, bigtime
  - aggregation/encapsulation techniques can help
  - can overprovision big links, per-flow ok on small links
  - scalability can be fixed, but no second chance

- Economic arrangements:
  - need sophisticated settlements between ISPs
  - right now, settlements are primitive (barter)

- User charging mechanisms: need QoS pricing
Differentiated Services

• Some traffic should get better treatment
  – application requirements: interactive vs bulk transfer
  – economic arrangements: first-class versus coach
• What kind of better service could you give?
  – measured by drops, or delay (and drops)
• How do you know which packets to give better service to?
  – bits in packet header
Traffic Limitations

- Can’t give all traffic better service!
- Must limit the amount of traffic that gets better service
- Service Level Agreements (SLA)
  - source agrees to limit amount of traffic in given class
  - network agrees to give that traffic “better” service
    - for a price!
  - economics play an important (fatal?) role in QoS
DiffServ “Code Points”

- Use six of the ToS bits in IP packet header
- Define various “code points”
- Each code point defines a desired per-hop behavior
  - a description of the service the packet should get
  - not a description of the router implementation of that service
“Expedited Forwarding”

- Give packet minimal delay and loss service
  - e.g., put EF packets in high priority queue

- To make this a true “absolute” service,
  - all SLAs must sum to less than the link speed
  - unlikely

- More likely, a way to assure relatively low delay
Is Delay the Problem?

- With RED, most queues are small
- Packets are dropped when queue starts to grow
- Thus, delays are mostly speed-of-light latency
- Service quality is mostly expressed by drop-rate
- Want to give traffic different levels of dropping
“Assured Forwarding”

- Packets are all serviced in order
  - makes TCP implementations perform well
- But some packets can be marked as low-drop and others as high-drop
  - think of it as priority levels for dropping
- Can be implemented using variations of RED
  - different drop probabilities for different classes
Example

- 10% premium traffic, 90% ordinary traffic
- Overall drop rate is 5%
- Can give premium traffic 0% drops, and ordinary traffic a 5.55% drop rate
- Can get a large improvement in service for the small class of traffic without imposing much of a penalty on the other traffic
  - count on SLAs to control premium traffic
Advantages of DiffServ

- Very simple to implement
- Can be applied to different granularities
  - flows
  - institutions
  - traffic types
- Marking can be done at edges or by hosts
- Allows easy peering (bilateral SLAs)
DiffServ Peering

- **Ingress routers**
  - Police/shape traffic
  - Set Differentiated Service Code Point (DSCP) in DiffServ (DS) field

- **Core routers**
  - Implement Per Hop Behavior (PHB) for each DSCP
  - Process packets based on DSCP
Disadvantages of DiffServ

- Service is still “best effort”, just a better class of best effort
  - except for EF, which has terrible efficiency
  - all traffic accepted (within SLAs)
- Some applications need better than this
  - certainly some apps need better service than today’s Internet delivers
  - but perhaps if DiffServ were widely deployed premium traffic would get great service (recall example)
  - nonetheless, let’s plunge ahead....
What You Need to Know

• Three kinds of QoS approaches
  – Link sharing, DiffServ, IntServ

• Some basic concepts:
  – differentiated dropping versus service priority
  – per-flow QoS (IntServ) versus per-aggregate QoS (DiffServ)
  – Admission control: parameter versus measurement
  – control plane versus data plane
  – controlled load versus guaranteed service
  – codepoints versus explicit signaling

• Various mechanisms:
  – playback points
  – token bucket
  – RSVP PATH/RESV messages
Factors Limiting QoS Deployment

• Prevalence of overprovisioning
  – if all links are only at 40% utilization, why do you need QoS?
  – lore says that inter-ISP links are not overprovisioned

• Primitive inter-ISP financial arrangements
  – QoS requires financial incentives to enforce tradeoffs
  – Current peering arrangements are not able to carry these incentives through in a meaningful way
    • must agree on pricing and service
    • currently agree on neither!

• End-users not used to pricing/performance options
QoS Debates

• Is overprovisioning enough?
  – if so, is this only because access links are slow?
  – what about Korea, Japan, and other countries with fast access links?
  – Disconnect: ISPs overprovision, users get bad service

• Is differentiated services enough?
  – can one really deliver reliable service just using relative priorities?
  – is EF service a viable option?

• It all depends on adaptability of applications