Advanced Computer Networks

TCP-Friendly Congestion Control

Jianping Pan Summer 2007

Review: congestion control

- Loss-based congestion control
 - e.g., TCP Tahoe, Reno, NewReno, etc
 - slow-start, congestion avoidance
 - timeout retransmit
 - fast retransmit, fast recovery
- Delay-based congestion control
 - e.g., TCP Vegas
 - more aggressive retransmission
 - less aggressive congestion avoidance
 - less aggressive slow start csc485b/586b/seng480b

TCP congestion control principles

- Packet conservation with ACK self-clocking
 - Q: why ACK self-clocking?
 - Q: when ACK self-clocking not working well?
 - Q: traffic with no ACK?
 - e.g., UDP-transported CBR (constant bit rate) flow
- Additive increase multiplicative decrease
 - Q: why AIMD?
 - alternatives: AIAD, MIAD, MIMD, etc
 - Q: the consequence of TCP AIMD
 - TCP: increase by one, reduce by half
 - or (1, 0.5)-AIMD

TCP-friendly congestion control

- For non-TCP traffic
 - particularly for multimedia traffic
 - no TCP-like per-packet acknowledgment
 - performance degrades severely due to rate-halving
 - to maintain friendliness with TCP
 - achieve the average throughput no more than a TCP flow can do under the same condition over a long time period
- Goal
 - allow TCP and non-TCP traffic to coexist
 - TCP traffic not adversely affected by non-TCP one
 - and vice versa

TCPFCC approaches

- Rate-based TCP-friendly congestion control
 - obtain the average throughput for TCP
 - Q: how to know the throughput of TCP
 - under the same network condition
 - e.g., packet loss ratio, round-trip time, etc
 - and set sending rate properly
- AIMD-based TCP-friendly congestion control
 - follow the same AIMD principle as TCP
 - with different sets of AIMD parameters
 - e.g., avoid rate-halving, etc
 - to maintain TCP friendliness

TCP throughput [MSMO97]

- A simple model
 - steady state
 - dupack only
 - fast recovery only
- Sawtooth cwnd
 - packets sent
 - W(p)
 - throughput



Limitations

- Limitations
 - sender's window = min {rwin, buffer, cwnd}
 - sender is not persistent
 - timeout not considered
 - slow-start not considered
 - short connections
 - periodic loss
 - some other TCP implementation details
- Upper bound
 - TCP throughput

$$BW < \left(\frac{MSS}{RTT}\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}$$

TCP throughput [PFTK98]

- A newer model
 - consider timeout
 - measurement indicates timeout is quite often
 - consider small receiver window
- Modeling approach
 - based on "rounds"
 - round: from the back-to-back transmission of W packets (cwnd size) till their first acknowledgment
 - RTT is independent of W
 - transmission time << RTT
 - packet loss: tail-drop

8

TD-only

- TDP: TD-period
 - initial cwnd: $W_{i-1}/2$
 - increased by 1/b MSS per round
 - b=2 for delayed ack
 - i.e., increased by ^{packe} 1 MSS per b rounds
- TCP throughput

$$\begin{split} B &= \frac{E[Y]}{E[A]} \\ E[Y] &= \frac{1-p}{p} + E[W] \\ E[A] &= (E[X]+1)E[r] \\ B(p) &= \frac{1}{RTT} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2bp}} + o(1/\sqrt{p}) \\ 6/18/67 \end{split}$$



TD and TO

Example

- timeout after T_o
- cwnd reset to 1 MSS
- timeout again after $2T_{0}$
 - timer backoff
- TCP throughput



How to determine Q



TCP throughput with TD and TO

• So far

$$B = \frac{E[Y] + Q * E[R]}{E[A] + Q * E[Z^{TO}]}$$

• How to determine E[R]

• HC,
$$k=1$$
 $k \in \mathbb{R}$ $k \in \mathbb{R}$

- TCP timer backoff
 - 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 64, 64, ...
- give up after a certain number of retries

$$L_{k} = \begin{cases} (2^{k} - 1)T_{0} & \text{for } k \leq 6 \\ (63 + 64(k - 6))T_{0} & \text{for } k \geq 7 \end{cases} \qquad E[Z^{TO}] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} L_{k}P[R = k] \\ = T_{0}\frac{1 + p + 2p^{2} + 4p^{3} + 8p^{4} + 16p^{5} + 32p^{6}}{1 - p} \end{cases}$$

6/18/07

$$B(p) \approx \frac{1}{RTT\sqrt{\frac{2bp}{3}} + T_0 \min\left(1, 3\sqrt{\frac{3bp}{8}}\right) p(1+32p^2)}$$
12

The impact of window limitation



Limitations

Discussion

AIMD-based congestion control

csc485b/586b/seng480b

- Follow the same AIMD principle as TCP
 - with parameters other than (1, 0.5)
- Example
 - one TCP and one AIMD
 - fluid model when underload: Al

$$\begin{split} & W_A(t + \Delta t) = W_A(t) + \alpha \cdot \Delta t & \frac{W_A(t + \Delta t) - W_A(t)}{W_T(t + \Delta t)} = \alpha \\ & - \text{fluid model when overload: MD} \end{split}$$

• r: bottleneck capacity

$$W_A(t_i) + W_T(t_i) = r$$
$$W_A(t_i^+) = \beta W_A(t_i)$$
$$W_T(t_i^+) = 0.5W_T(t_i)$$



6/18/07

TCP-friendly AIMD parameters

Converged window size in overload state

$$W_A(t_*) = \frac{r \cdot \alpha}{2(1-\beta) + \alpha}$$
$$W_T(t_*) = \frac{r \cdot 2(1-\beta)}{2(1-\beta)}$$

• Average window Size

$$\overline{W_A} = \frac{(1+\beta)}{2} W_A(t_*) = \frac{(1+\beta)\alpha r}{4(1-\beta)+2\alpha}$$
$$\overline{W_T} = \frac{(1+0.5)}{2} W_T(t_*) = \frac{3(1-\beta)r}{4(1-\beta)+2\alpha}$$
• TCP-trienaly condition:

 $\overline{W_A} = \overline{W_T}.$

$$\alpha = \frac{3(1-\beta)}{1+\beta}$$

• For two AIMD flows: $\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2} = \frac{(1+\beta_2)(1-\beta_1)}{(1-\beta_2)(1+\beta_1)}$

This lecture

- TCP-friendly congestion control
 - for non-TCP traffic
 - ack self-clocking issue
 - rate-halving problem
 - two approaches
 - rate-based (or equation-based)
 - AIMD-based
- Explore further
 - http://www.icir.org/padhye/tcp-model.html
 - http://www.psc.edu/networking/tcp_friendly.html

Next lecture

- Explicit congestion control
 - [KDR02] Dina Katabi, Mark Handley, and Chalrie Rohrs. Congestion Control for High Bandwidth-Delay Product Networks. In the proceedings on ACM Sigcomm 2002. [XCP]

- Student presentations are back
 - presenters are notified one week in advance